



IPSE, IPSA: IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM: WHICH?

(The Latin Various Readings, GENESIS iii. 15.)

Controversial Letters in answer to the above question, and in
Vindication of the Position assigned by the Catholic Church
to the Ever-Blessed Mother of the World's Redeemer
in the Divine Economy of Man's Salvation.

IN REPLY TO

The Right Reverend Dr. Kingdon, Coadjutor (Anglican) Bishop
of Fredericton, New Brunswick, and "John M. Davenport,
Priest of the Mission Church," Ritualist Minister,
St. John, New Brunswick.

BY

RICHARD F. QUIGLEY, LL.B.,

(HARVARD AND BOSTON UNIVERSITIES), BARRISTER-AT-LAW, ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK,
CANADA.

"Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For He that is mighty
has done great things to me, and holy is His name."—ST. LUKE, i. 48-49.

BALLOON
SANT-SUPP

FR. PUSTET & CO.,
NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

FOR SALE BY

T. O'BRIEN & CO., ST. JOHN, N. B. D. & J. SADLER & CO., MONTREAL, CAN.

100-101284
101-101284

PREFACE.

THE occasion of writing the letters here republished, sufficiently appears from the "Report" of Bishop Kingdon's Lecture and the letter thereon in the first pages of this volume, and need not be foreshadowed in an introduction. The writer's motive, indeed, lay deeper, and he strikes the key-note in these words :

"What I desiderate in Protestant teachers is a knowledge of the Catholic doctrines they attack. In the conscientious discharge of their duties from their standpoint, they may feel themselves obliged to point out errors (so called) in the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Of this no reasonable man can complain, but for heaven's sake, let them first learn exactly what these doctrines are. We will then have less of the wild figments of hysterical imaginations and pandemonium caricatures of beliefs, in defence of which the mightiest intellects that ever adorned our race have found their highest sphere, and of which genius allied with sanctity have ever been the most persuasive and enthusiastic exponents."

Here I appeal for "*more light*" on the part of virtuous and high-minded Protestants. I would excite a spirit of enquiry, create a distrust of impressions mechanically imbibed in youth, and perpetuated and permanently fixed by more serious studies *on the same lines*. I would force back the honest mind upon the sources of its knowledge, induce it to reconsider the process by which its religious convictions touching Catholic doctrine were formed, and, with a more matured knowledge of the conclusion, to re-investigate the premises on which it is grounded. The Catholic Church, I delight to proclaim, has nothing to fear from the closest and most minute investigation. It is ignorance which is the great Anti-Christ; and sincere inquiry and honest research are the only antidote. These we ceaselessly challenge—yet, for the most part, in vain. Why, we Catholics ask again and again, are we to be insulted and slan-

dered, calumniated and taunted, day after day, year after year, with doctrines which we have a thousand times formally and distinctly repudiated? Why are the insults, slanders, calumnies, and taunts repeated without even an allusion to the defence?

I shall have done all that I proposed if I have succeeded in satisfying thoughtful and fair-minded Protestants that the Catholic religion is very far different from the absurd and revolting caricature so long held up to their abhorrence and execration,—if I have not failed to show that the religion against which so many of their teachers and writers inveigh under the name of the Catholic religion, is a religion which Catholics themselves would detest most cordially—if such a religion really existed.

These letters, I need hardly say, were not designed to appear in a collective form. They are now, however, reproduced out of regard to the wishes, perseveringly urged, of known and unknown readers, Protestant and Catholic, who professed to have received them with much interest. They are republished, too, as originally issued, excepting a few verbal corrections and the addition of a few lines at the end of Letter XII., which I have enclosed in [], and which slipped out in the hurry of preparing the printer's MS. of that letter. I have, also, here and there throughout the volume, added postscripts, and a few notes, both as references and in further proof of the positions taken in the text. The more elaborate notes which I had intended to make, would but distract the general reader, and the learned in such matters do not need them.

The volume is made up of four parts, namely: the *Preliminary Letters*, *Résumé*, *Rejoinder*, and *Rebutter*. The first is intended to give the reader a general conspectus of the origin and progress of the discussion, and of the initial attitude of my opponents; the *Résumé* is a consideration of the arguments advanced up to that stage in the debate; the *Rejoinder* is my reply to their *Strictures* on the *Résumé*; and the *Rebutter* is my answer to their second series of *Strictures*. I can assure the reader that he will get from these letters a full and complete idea of the whole controversy; for, I have made it their especial feature to set out in my opponents' own words not

only their strongest positions, but every semblance of argument in the *Strictures*. Indeed, I do not hesitate to say, that a much clearer impression can be gained from these letters alone than if my opponents' confused and illogical jumble were in the hands of the reader—even when purged of the disgraceful blunders for which they had repeatedly to apologize.

In discussing such topics as have engaged us in this controversy, I had rather "bear my sword hid in a myrtle branch" and keep it there, than make a merciless onslaught on my opponents and scourge them "hip and thigh." But the Vicar, though my *nominal* opponent only, has not allowed me to act in this courteous spirit. The combat must be what the adversary makes it. In his very first letter (the third preliminary), he deliberately surrendered all claims to participate in the rights of controversial chivalry. By the insolence, ignorance, stupidity, and malice there displayed, he forced the button from off my foil, and obliged me to thrust my weapon home. He compelled me to treat him as a knight of old would have dealt with a churl who had assailed him with base, ungentle weapons. In this particular, I trust to the candor and "sweet reasonableness" of my opponents, however multitudinously and multifariously *real*, for a hearty and whole-souled appreciation of my good-will in their regard.

There remains that I should say a word on the matter of these letters. The construction and logical order of the different parts was supplied by the tactics of my opponents; the substance was furnished by Catholic and Protestant Biblical critics, and Catholic theologians of the highest authority. *Huc undique gaza*. On the academic question involved in the discussion, the quotations made will speak for themselves. Here it is a most noteworthy fact, that in *no one instance* did my opponents dare to dispute them, while in nearly every case I have turned their relevant authorities against themselves, and with crushing force. But what is more remarkably disgraceful: they passed over in silence citations which are absolutely crucial, and everlastingly definitive of the questions which, in their ignorance, they had raised. While I do not profess to be exhaustive under this head, I can assure the reader he has before

him the results of some labor and careful research among many learned volumes. But I have not grudged it, and I am refreshed by the thought: *Et hæc olim meminisse juvabit.*

In the purely theological exposition of Catholic doctrine, I am reminded of, and desire to pay homage to the dictum of the old philosopher: *Alienas sarcinas adoro.* Here my occupation has been but to kneel and pick up the "gem(s) of purest ray serene" from the writings of Cardinals Wiseman, Newman, Manning; the giant Jesuits, Fathers Harper and Passaglia, and the illustrious Reviewers, Doctors Ward and Brownson. The extent of my indebtedness to them will be easily recognized by students familiar with their works. I have made the very freest use of their arguments and language, incorporating them with my own on occasions impossible to specify in detail. This is especially true of Father Harper's, and those of Doctor Ward in the *Dublin Review*. My obligations to other Catholic writers, whether in Latin or in English, I have acknowledged, each in its proper place, so far as I know them. I will make mention here, too, of the learned Nicholas' work: *La Vierge Marie d'après l'Evangile et dans l'Eglise*, and that of l'Abbé Petitalot: *La Vierge Mère d'après la Théologie*, from both of which I have also drawn. Specific and detailed acknowledgment of my obligations to learned Catholic theologians is, however, of the less consequence here, since my appeal throughout is to facts, and to reason in its legitimate, and, to me, imperative action on Christian principles admitted and professed by Protestants. For their instruction my exposition of Catholic doctrine, on the points in dispute, is written,—to them it is addressed. I pretend to no discovery, no invention. My aim has been but to focalize for the general reader a few scintillations of what the faith, and piety, and learning of some of the brightest intellects and the purest hearts among the children of the Catholic Church, have handed down on the religious topics discussed in these letters. If my readers derive from their perusal any profit at all commensurate with the delight I experienced in preparing them, I will feel amply rewarded for my labor.

R. F. Q.

Feast of the Assumption, 1890.

PRELIMINARY LETTERS.

EXTRACT from a Report in the *St. John Globe*, November 23, 1887, of a Lecture on "MISPRINTS," delivered by the Right Reverend Doctor Kingdon, Coadjutor Bishop of Fredericton, New Brunswick:

"CHURCH OF ENGLAND INSTITUTE.

"Rev. Canon Brigstocke occupied the chair in Trinity Church School-House last evening, and in a few graceful words introduced the Right Rev. Dr. Kingdon as the lecturer of the evening. The subject was 'Misprints,' but the lecture covered more than the title indicates, for it abounded in illustrations of errors of all kinds, having their origin in copying, in printing, in pronunciation, and in transposition, and in changes of form and in changes of sound.

.
"SOMETIMES THE SUBSTITUTION OF ONE LETTER FOR ANOTHER MADE A VAST DIFFERENCE, AND AS AN ILLUSTRATION OF THIS HE REFERRED TO THE WORDS IPSE AND IPSA, THE LATTER WORD IN AN IMPORTANT PASSAGE IN THE DOUAY (SIC) BIBLE BEING THE FOUNDATION OF THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. . . ."

I.

LETTER FROM MR. QUIGLEY.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM.

To the Editor of The Globe:

SIR,—I very much enjoyed the Right Rev. Dr. Kingdon's lecture on "Misprints," a short report of which you gave last evening. His Lordship made a strong appeal for accuracy and correctness, and yet, by a strange Nemesis, grievously erred in

his illustration of their importance, based upon the words *ipse* and *ipsa*, and his statement in connection therewith. Here, by a misprint of the letter "a" for the letter "e," said his Lordship, there lamentably resulted that thirty-three years ago the Roman Catholic Church was led to promulgate the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. The inference, I assume, he intended his hearers to draw was that the alleged foundation for the doctrine being, in these days at all events, a clear and confessed mistake, the church had fallen into grave doctrinal error in declaring it to be a truth of the Christian religion. I aim to report the Bishop correctly, though only substantially, and in the criticism I propose to make I desire to avoid the very semblance of the *odium theologicum* and to treat him with the utmost respect and courtesy.

Now, I begin by saying that the Bishop's statement is not only wholly incorrect and baseless, but to me his misapprehension is simply appalling. The case for a misprint even, and quite regardless of the consequence deplored by him as resulting from it, is far otherwise than that stated by his Lordship. The discussion raised by him is not between *ipse* and *ipsa* alone, but between them and the word *ipsum*. Why did he not so put it, since this is the real state of the question? To make the points at issue perfectly intelligible I will here set down the *matter* of the dispute, viz.: *Genesis* iii. 15—according to the different versions. Protestant version: *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; IT shall bruise thy head, etc.*; Douay version: *I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; SHE shall crush thy head, etc.*; The Vulgate: *Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, et semen tuum et semen illius; IPSA conteret caput tuum, etc.* This whole text has been called by the early writers in the church the Proto-Gospel, for it contains a promise of the future Savior. It is, therefore, to Protestant and Catholic alike of transcendent importance and very comprehensive application; but it will be observed that the present contention is over the *first word* of the second clause only: "*IT shall bruise thy head,*" etc.; "*SHE shall crush thy head,*" etc. The Hebrew text from which both

translations *ultimately* come is according to the learned Cardinal Bellarmine ambiguous, and in consequence *three* different readings prevailed among ecclesiastical writers as follows: *IPSE conteret caput tuum*—HE (Christ) shall bruise thy head; *IPSA conteret caput tuum*—SHE (the woman, the Blessed Virgin, through Christ her Seed) shall crush thy head; *IPSUM conteret caput tuum*—IT (her seed that is Christ), shall bruise thy head. Why, then, confine the question of misprint to *ipse* and *ipsa* and ignore *ipsum*, the Protestant reading, which itself rejects *ipse*? The simple truth is that his Lordship's theory of a misprint and his statement thereon is sheer nonsense. There is absolutely no difference *in sense*, to the Catholic mind at least, between these three readings. The learned commentator Cornelius à Lapide, says "all are true"—*omnes sunt veræ*. The Almighty promises that the triumph over Satan is to be complete and his power broken by Christ, who is the seed of the woman. The Protestant version adopts "*IPSUM*"—"IT," because it thinks it more literally in accord with the true Hebrew reading and that of some of the ancient fathers. The Douay version "*IPSA*"—"SHE" follows the Vulgate, which is sanctioned by almost all the Latin Fathers, including such names as St. Augustine, St. Gregory, St. Ambrose, St. Bernard, Victor and Avitus, as well as by (the Latin translator of) St. Chrysostom, Bede, Alcuin, and many others. And thus it becomes a mere quillet of verbal criticism! So much for the academic aspect of the question.

And now what becomes of the Bishop's assertion that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is founded on a misprint? It vanishes into thin air. Of course I am not now discussing the truth of this doctrine, but simply correcting an amazing misconception. Unfortunately such misconceptions are too common among our Protestant brethren where the honor of the Blessed Virgin, the mother of Christ—the "Woman! above all women glorified, our tainted nature's solitary boast," as the Protestant Wordsworth addresses her—is concerned. And while Protestant churches will resound with the praises of Sarah and Rebecca and Rachel, of Miriam and Ruth, of Esther and Judith of the Old Testament, and of

Elizabeth and Anna, of Magdalen and Martha of the New, the name of Mary, the mother of Christ, is uttered with bated breath lest the sound of her name should make the preacher liable to the charge of superstition. I do not think of imputing such views to his lordship, but the animus of Kemnitzius and others in discussing this translation in another connection is born of such ignorant prejudice, and I do imagine their interpretations led to his mistake. Catholics do not forget the Blessed Virgin's own prediction of that honor which the church in all ages should pay to her—"all generations shall call me blessed,"—Luke i. 48; and we believe with St. Epiphanius that "*it is no less criminal to vilify the holy Virgin than to glorify her above measure.*" But enough. I have tried to make the matter clear. There is nothing at all in the Bishop's point. I, as a Catholic, have no more interest in retaining "IPSA," "SHE," in the text than he has, so far as the Immaculate Conception is concerned. Words have been corrected in the Vulgate since the Council of Trent by Popes Sixtus V. and Clement VIII.; so, if, by the discovery of new MSS. or otherwise, it be found that "IT" or "HE," and not "SHE" is the true reading, no objection will no doubt be made. But the sublime doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and its definition will not be affected by the change, because it is not dependent upon nor founded on it. It will stand forever all the same, and, perhaps, his lordship and others who now grudgingly "give honor where honor is due" will then have learned to say: *Dignare me laudare te, Virgo Sacrata: Da mihi virtutem contra hostes tuos.*

Respectfully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

Ritchie's Building,
Thursday, Nov. 24th, 1887. }

[Mr. Quigley having signed his letter, no letters on this subject will be published unless the writers' names are given.—
GLOBE.]

II.

LETTER FROM REV. MR. CAMPBELL.

THE RECTORY, DORCHESTER, N. B., Nov. 29.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—In last evening's issue Mr. Quigley quotes three Latin versions of Gen. iii. 15. I have a Latin version of the whole Bible, including the Apocrypha—but wanting the title-page and the date—which agrees with no one of the three quoted. I send my reading to you merely as a contribution to the literature of the discussion. On the main argument I say nothing in this communication; for it may be fairly assumed that his Lordship will make Mr. Quigley a fitting reply.

But I would like to ask whether any of your readers have a copy of the same version; and, if they have, whether they will kindly state what version it is, with the date of publication? The verse reads thus: “Praeterea inimicitiam pono inter te et mulierem hanc similiterq; inter semen tuum et semen hujus; hoc conteret tibi caput, tu autem conteres huic calcaneum.”

Yours obediently,

J. ROY CAMPBELL.

III.

LETTER FROM MR. DAVENPORT.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—Surely Mr. Quigley is not correct in his criticism on Genesis iii. 15. He asks somewhat indignantly why Bishop Kingdon, in his lecture did not put the real state of the question before his hearers, and tell them the dispute was not between *Ipse* and *Ipsa*, but also between *Ipsum*. Where then is

to be found a Latin version of the Bible with *Ipsum* in this passage? I have never read of it in any commentary. Jerome's old Vulgate, made direct from the Hebrew, has the masculine *Ipsē*—the modern Vulgate in spite of this has *Ipsa*. Where is the *Ipsum*? Because the English version speaks of the "Seed of the woman" as *It*, it must not be supposed that the neuter occurs in the Hebrew original, or in either the Greek or Latin versions thereof. It is not true that in speaking of the promised offspring of the woman as *It*, the English translators rejected *Ipsē*, as Mr. Quigley says.

The "academic aspect of the question," to borrow Mr. Quigley's phrase, stands thus: The Hebrew has a masculine pronoun followed by a masculine verb "He shall bruise." It is true that if the pronoun stood alone without the vowel-pointing, as in the old style of writing Hebrew, it could not be told without looking at the verb what was its gender. About the verb (y'shuphcāh), however, there is not and never has been a doubt because it begins with the masculine affix. Therefore the translators of the modern vulgate are without excuse in adopting a feminine translation of the pronoun, and thus doing violence to the verb, more especially as they had the grand old vulgate of Jerome before their eyes to keep them right. So plain is the Hebrew here that the Septuagint translators (who accomplished their task three centuries before the coming of Christ), while adopting a neuter word *sperma* for "seed," nevertheless use a masculine pronoun *autos* here to represent it.

Bishop Kingdon's statement, therefore, it seems to me, is not as Mr. Quigley says, "wholly incorrect and baseless," even if his "misapprehension be simply appalling" to Mr. Quigley.

I confess that if the Bishop asserted that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin was *founded* on a misprint, it was too bald and unqualified a statement. Many things helped to stereotype it besides this error. At the same time it must be borne in mind that this mistranslation has been long and much used in the Roman Church for the undue exaltation of the Holy Virgin, while it is very noteworthy that Pope Pius IX., when promulgating the Dogma in S. Peter's

at Rome, December 8, 1854, alluded for its defence to this very text, and, moreover, afterwards set up a memorial column of the event in the city, on the top of which stands a figure of the Blessed Virgin (without the holy child, mark you, in her arms) trampling the serpent under foot. This representation of the bruising of the serpent's head *by the woman*, everybody knows has been for years and still is very common among Roman Catholics. Therefore it is no exaggeration to say that the modern vulgate mistranslation of Genesis iii. 15 has largely helped to smooth the way for the promulgation of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.

There is one other point in Mr. Quigley's letter I cannot suffer myself to pass over unnoticed. In my opinion he would have been wiser in his own cause had he been less satirical about the neglect of the Holy Virgin by Christians outside the Roman Church. Who is to blame, let me ask, for their present attitude towards her? Who has rendered it well-nigh impossible for them to yield her her proper place and dignity as chief of saints? None other than the Roman Church herself, with her exaggerated and too often idolatrous devotions offered to her.

I must prove such a serious charge as this. I will take two well-known books, in use among Roman Catholics of all lands. "Liguori's Glories of Mary," and "The Raccolta." The first named is a book approved by the highest authorities of the Roman Church, and formally recommended to Anglo-Romans by Cardinals Wiseman and Manning. In that book are to be found such instructions as these: "Mary is our only refuge, help and asylum." "Often we shall be heard more quickly, and be thus preserved, if we have recourse to Mary and call upon *her* name, *than we should be if we called on the name of Jesus, our Saviour.*" "Many things are asked from God and are not granted; they are asked from Mary and are obtained." "At the command of the Virgin all things obey, even God." (*Imperio Virginis omnia famulantur, etiam Deus.*)

"The salvation of all depends on their being favored and protected by Mary. He who is protected by Mary will be saved; he who is not, will be lost. Mary has only to speak, and her Son executes all." (See Littledale, p. 55.)

In the second book mentioned are to be found devotions to the Virgin in keeping with these impious utterances.

When on a visit to Rome, in 1880, I purchased an English copy of the "Raccolta," at the Propaganda, in order to test the accuracy of Littledale's quotations. The "Raccolta" is a popular Roman manual of indulgenced devotions. My copy is dated, Woodstock College, Maryland, 1878. About 130 out of 450 pages are devoted directly to the Virgin, while she finds mention in nearly all the devotions. The following irapicous acts of worship and prayer are taken from the "Second Novena in preparation for the Feast of our Lady's Nativity," p. 275 (the italics are mine): "We hail thee, dear child, and we *humbly worship* thy most holy body; we venerate thy sacred swaddling clothes wherewith they bound thee, the sacred cradle," &c.

Prayer: "Most lovely child, who by Thy birth has comforted the world, made glad the heavens, struck terror to hell, brought help to the fallen, &c. . . . We pray Thee with all fervent love, *be Thou born again in spirit in our souls*, through Thy most holy love; renew our fervor in Thy service, rekindle in our hearts *the fire of Thy love*, and bid all virtues blossom there, which may cause us to find more and more favor in Thy gracious eyes. Mary! be thou Mary to us, and may we feel the saving power of Thy sweetest name. Let it ever be our comfort to call on that great name in all our troubles; let it be our hope in dangers, our shield in temptation, and in death our last murmur."

Herein we find expressions of worship and supplication such as Christians are wont to present only to God, or the Incarnate Son, or the Holy Spirit. We could not say more at the cradle of Jesus, nor could we pay more honor to the Blessed Paraclete Himself than to beg Him to "rekindle in our hearts the fire of His love."

Now this book has on its title-page, "Published by order of His Holiness Pope Pius IX. Translation authorized and approved by the Sacred Congregation of Holy Indulgences"; while in the preface people are urged to use this book, because then they may feel perfectly assured the indulgences are all right.

The Roman Church, therefore, is thoroughly committed to this book with all its enormities.

Surely it is the duty of all lovers of "the truth as it is in Jesus," *i. e.*, all true Catholic Christians, to come out of a church which puts its imprimatur upon such idolatrous worship as this, and it ill becomes one who accepts such extravagances to chide those who, for fear of them, fall short of their duty.

It ought to be remembered, in this connection, that the Church of England has preserved her balance well under the circumstances, and observes four feasts yearly in honor of the Holy Mother.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,
Priest of the Mission Church,
Portland, St. John, N. B.

November 28, 1887.

IV.

LETTER FROM MR. QUIGLEY.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—Two communications have appeared in your columns anent mine of Monday last, from writers with whom I had no quarrel. One purports to be an answer and a defense (?) of Bishop Kingdon. Surely the Bishop must feel—*Non tali auxilio!* Save me from my friends: I will look after my enemies myself!

"*It may be fairly assumed,*" says the second writer, "that His Lordship will make . . . a *fitting* reply." I think so too. The Bishop, deservedly no doubt, gets credit for "pluck" in more departments than one. He is also a man of honor, and recalling his own thought—"humanum est errare—to err is human"—often expressed during his lecture, will not, I

think, hesitate to acknowledge his kinship with our common humanity, by making an *amende honorable* for his error touching the old church to which he owes at least fair play.

Respectfully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

Ritchie's Building,
Friday Morning, Dec. 2d, '87.

V.

LETTER FROM MR. DAVENPORT.

MR. QUIGLEY'S CRITICISMS ON BISHOP KINGDON'S LECTURE.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—It is as I suspected when I criticised hypothetically what was attributed to Bishop Kingdon by Mr. Quigley. The Bishop has been misrepresented.

Bishop Kingdon has not seen Mr. Quigley's letter, but he has kindly taken the trouble to give me the substance of his own remarks and also some quotations from his lecture. With regard to the Hebrew and Greek texts of Gen. iii. 15, he went over much the same ground as myself in my strictures on Mr. Quigley. He proved also from several of the chief Fathers of the Church that it was far from their mind to attribute the bruising of the Serpent's head to the Virgin; and simply said that the mistake *ipsa* for *ipse* had acquired a tremendous importance from being quoted in the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by Pius IX.¹ He neither said nor implied that "the dogma was founded on a misprint." I

¹ It is my duty to say that what is here attributed to Bishop Kingdon is utterly untrue. He attempted nothing of the kind. The writer, later on in the discussion, swallows his own falsehood and does his little best to prove that "the dogma *was* founded on a misprint."

R. F. Q.

hope, therefore, now Mr. Quigley has been proved in error on every point, he will see his way to act upon his own recommendation which appeared in your to-day's issue. Mr. Quigley seems somewhat indignant that any one should notice his letters besides the person attacked. Why then did he appear in public? and why reproach people in general who refuse to worship the Virgin Mary?

In conclusion, allow me to draw the attention of your readers to a quotation made by Mr. Quigley from S. Epiphanius (I have not verified it, but it will suit my purpose as it stands), which he thinks very telling against persons outside his church, but which, "by a strange Nemesis," points its darts against himself and co-religionists. "It is no less criminal," says the saint, "to vilify the Holy Virgin than to glorify her above measure." Now, I suppose that not even the most rabid protestant will dissent from the assertion that it is a crime to vilify the Blessed Virgin or indeed any other saint living or departed—it remains, however, for Mr. Quigley and his friends to tell us how much further we should go than Liguori and the *Raccolta* I quoted in glorifying the Holy Virgin before we become criminous. I have no doubt myself what the answer of S. Epiphanius himself would be.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,
Priest of the Mission Church.

December 2d, 1887.

VI.

LETTER FROM MR. QUIGLEY.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I am not, the public cannot be, satisfied with the latest *shuffle* in this matter of the writer in Saturday's paper.

It is quite "too thin,"—too *diaphonous* indeed and your interested readers will easily "catch on." To exhaust every obligation of courtesy to the Bishop I have had *all* the papers sent to him to-day. The talk about misrepresentation is simply absurd. Mr. Ellis, of the *GLOBE*, was present at the lecture, and the *GLOBE*'s report (Nov. 23) sustains me. The Bishop said substantially what I have charged against him and *on the spot immediately after the lecture* I protested to Mr. G. Herbert Lee, Secretary to Lecture Committee, against the incorrectness and unfairness of the Bishop's statement. But Saturday's letter makes it even worse for the Bishop, and I cannot believe he will so stultify himself as to adopt it as a part of his defence. However, I propose patiently to await his action after he will have seen the *GLOBE*'s report, my first letter and the subsequent correspondence. In this country, happily, no man in church or state is beyond the reach of fair criticism of his public utterances. If the Bishop is content with the defence made for him, I will not complain.

The Bishop's defender says I am indignant that any one besides the Bishop should notice my letter. Surely I have not manifested thus far any indignation. I regret if my inattention has unduly wounded his vanity. I did not mean it. I only desire to give the Bishop an opportunity to vindicate himself or to refuse to do so. In either case, I perhaps ought to assure his defender, I will not forget him. Meanwhile let him castigate somewhat his vanity and cultivate the spiritual temper by reading "Liguori and the Raccolta."

Respectfully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

Ritchie's Building, Monday, A. M.

VII.

LETTER FROM MR. QUIGLEY.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A CHALLENGE.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—This matter has now assumed a new phase. I meant my criticism of Bishop Kingdon's statements, as set out in my first letter, to be a candid talk between gentlemen with you as my interlocutor. I sought, by the "sweet reasonableness" of a logic of facts and authority, at once simple and irenic, to lead his Lordship to avow and correct a mistake into which he might have unwittingly fallen. I was willing, even, to concede something to his iconoclastic research and fancy, by granting that *ipsa* might be a misprint for *ipse* or *ipsum* indeed, if he would only forego the luxury of creating a new anti-Catholic tradition in this city by connecting such misprint with the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as cause and effect. I proved unanswerably that there is no difference *in sense* to the Catholic mind between the *three* readings, and consequently there is no choice so far as any matter of doctrine is concerned. I have waited a reasonable time for some sign. His Lordship, however, dies, and—*impenitent*, except so far as vicarious utterances can be made to do duty. The vicar is "John M. Davenport, Priest of the Mission Church." Why should I waste words here over the vicar's wretched attempt to deal with the "academic aspect of the question"? "Where, then, is to be found," he asks, "a Latin version of the Bible with *ipsum* in this passage? I have never read of it in any commentary." Therefore, of course, there is no such reading; though, after opening another bottle of fog, he straightway confesses that the statement charged against the Bishop was "*too bald and unqualified*."

And now the vicar warms to his work! Verily 'tis the shriek of a lost spirit or the scream of a drunken Beelzebub! Sophocles was accused of madness and wrote the "ŒDIPUS AT

COLONOS" as his vindication. This yeleft "priest" is taxed with "*papistical inclinings*," by more consistent Protestants, and behold his answer: "Extravagances," "Enormities," "Impious utterances," "Impious acts of worship and prayer," "Idoltrous devotions," "Idoltrous worship!" Good God! What monstrous charges! And from such a quarter, my Protestant fellow-citizens will say—*Et tu Brute!* The creed of a Fenelon, Vincent de Paul, Aquinas, Xavier, De Sales, Augustine, Bute, Ripon, Lyons, Newman, Manning, Leo XIII., so characterized! But there is a compensation. One of the chief glories of our time is its abhorrence of bloated, spongy shams, religious or otherwise—mere show without substance. No creed can live in its stormy surf that will not bear its piercing light. It demands from every man "a reason for the faith that is in him." I thank God for this. No mere newspaper letters are, it seems to me, at all adequate to the proper discussion of the above charges. I love to meet my opponent on any important question face to face in the presence of my fellow-citizens. I have a profound trust in their intellectual honesty. Therefore, sir, through you, I now challenge the Right Reverend Dr. Kingdon, Coadjutor Bishop of Fredericton, and "John M. Davenport, Priest of the Mission Church," to a public discussion, in the Institute or elsewhere, of the position of the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of the Redeemer, in Catholic theology, when I will undertake to vindicate that position to the intellect and conscience of my fellow-citizens from Tradition, Reason, and Holy Scripture.

To facilitate matters, I will request Rev. Dr. Bennet,¹ Dr. A. A. Stockton,² Dr. Alward,³ Thomas Millidge, Esquire,⁴ and Hon. R. J. Ritchie,⁵ to act as my committee to meet a like committee from my opponents for the purpose of arranging the details of the discussion. And may God defend the right.

Respectfully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

Ritchie's Building,

Feast of the Immaculate Conception, Dec. 8, 1887.

¹ Presbyterian, ² Methodist, ³ Baptist, ⁴ Anglican, ⁵ Catholic.

VIII.

LETTER FROM THE VICAR.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—What would be thought of a lawn tennis player who, after choosing his own court, petulantly demanded a change before the finish of the set simply because after desperate efforts he had failed to score ?

I cannot accede to your correspondent's request, however polite and polished the style of his invitation may be. I see nothing to be gained by doing so. The public has an excellent view of our position and can fairly judge the issue of our contention more fairly and deliberately, I think, than if we adjourned to the limited area of the Institute.

The matter is very simple. Mr. Quigley has impugned Bishop Kingdon's scholarship, and has emphasized, in the title of his letters, what he considers an important emendation. He has also censured all Christians who do not worship the Blessed Virgin.

I have, therefore, asked him, in the first place, to mention some of those standard Latin versions of the Bible he accused the Bishop of overlooking. He has now had a fortnight for the search and probably the help of learned friends. Let him produce his witnesses—a few lines in your paper can notify them—or else let him make the *amende honorable*.

Again—if I made misstatements with regard to the meaning of the Hebrew or Septuagint renderings of Genesis iii. 15, a few lines of solid argument will ensure my discomfiture. If, moreover, I have misquoted Liguori's "Glories of Mary," or the "Raccolta," he can easily expose my deceit. If, however, he cannot do this, then I contend that the public are already in possession of facts (though I could easily multiply them) which amply justify the expressions I used about the worship of the Virgin in the Roman Catholic communion.

It would be an excellent thing if all your readers would secure for themselves copies of "Liguori" and the "Raccolta." I will make no further disclosures till occasion requires.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,
Priest of the Mission Church.

December 9, 1887.

IX.

LETTER FROM THE VICAR.

IPSE, IPSA.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—Though the controversy on Genesis iii. 15 seems now over, the interest it has awakened is not. I shall feel obliged, therefore, if, for the benefit of Biblical students, you will allow me a little space for an extract from a famous living Italian Roman Catholic scholar of catacomb-inscription celebrity, De Rossi, on Genesis iii. 15. He enumerates thirty-five "most exceedingly and insurmountable original authorities and witnesses" in support of the masculine "*He* shall bruise the serpent's head." Among them (1) all trustworthy Hebrew MSS.; (2) the analogy of the "sacred context, in which the verb which follows and the pronoun suffixed are masculine; (3) the Samaritan text and Samaritan version; (4) the Greek version of the Septuagint, all the MS. editions and versions derived from it, Ethiopic, Coptic, and Old Latin, and those who used it, whether Greek-speaking Jews, as Philo, or Christian writers, agreeing; (5) all the Chaldee paraphrases, Onkelos, Jonathan, and the Jerusalem; (6) all the other versions of the East, the oldest Syriac, the Arabic of Saadias, the Mauritanian Arabic of Erpenius, the Persian of Tawes; (7) some MSS. of the Vulgate . . . ; (8) many editions of the Vulgate

on the margin, before those of Sixtus and Clement; (9) the pure version of Jerome in the *Bibliotheca Divina*, edited by the Benedictines of S. Maur, Opp. T. 1."

Then follows a long list of the Fathers who quote the masculine.¹ He then asserts, "the masculine reading is better, by which the bruising of the serpent is ascribed *immediately* and *alone* to the Seed of the woman, and from which the redemption, power, and divinity of the Messiah are plainly elicited."

His conclusion reads as follows: "To whomsoever, then, the present reading of the Vulgate (i. e., 'She,' the woman, 'shall bruise,' &c.) belongs, whether to the interpreter, or (which is more probable) to the amanuensis, it *ought to be amended* from the Hebrew and Greek fountain-heads, and to be referred to those passages of the Clementine edition, which yet can and ought to be conformed to the Hebrew text, *and to be amended by the authority of the Church.*" (The italics are mine.) De Rossi, Varr. Lectt. Vet. Test., Vol. iv. App. pp. 208, 209, 211.

Here, then, is overwhelming evidence of the accuracy of our translators of the Bible in this particular.

It must, however, prove very perplexing to those who have built so much upon the false reading.

Canon Oakley, an Ultramontane of the Ultramontanes, says in his review of Dr. Pusey's *Irenicon* (1866): "I now come to what we (Roman Catholics) regard as the *Scriptural germ* of every doctrine, and the *legitimate ground* of every authorized devotion on the subject of the Blessed Virgin. I mean the prediction of her office in the Christian Dispensation, uttered by Almighty God at the time of the fall," (viz., Gen. iii. 15).

This is a very strong statement, and ought to be exceeding startling to those who accept it, now that such a great Roman Catholic authority as De Rossi has convicted the text of very serious fundamental error, especially when it is known that Liguori (*Glories of Mary*, Pt. II. Disc. 1), Pope Pius IX., and many of the Bishops who asked him to promulge the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception, based their chief arguments in

¹ "The Fathers" quote the masculine *and the neuter*.

favor of it on the false reading in some such terms as these: "She who was said to crush Satan could never have been even for a moment, even in her mother's womb, under original sin." Very startling, I say, since, in the apt phrase of Dr. Pusey, "the major premise of the argument is gone, when it appears that nothing is said here (Gen. iii. 15) of any personal victory of hers." It was to the Seed of the Woman, God Incarnate, directly and personally, that the crushing of the Serpent's head was attributed, not to the woman nor to Him in conjunction with her, but to *Him alone*, and it is in Him and through Him that all faithful Christians are enabled to crush Satan under their feet also.

Thanking you for your space, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,
Priest of the Mission Church.

December 15, 1887.

POSTSCRIPT.

I beg to call the special attention of my readers to the above letter. The Vicar here commences with malicious earnestness that career of fraud, falsehood, and dishonesty which he ran so recklessly during this discussion. He has been guilty of the very grossest kind of literary forgery in dealing with Father De Rossi, while his calumny on Father Oakley has branded him with the mark of Cain. I exposed his infamy here, and challenged him over and over again, but he dared not to open his mouth in reply. Of the statements made on his own authority in this letter, *not one is true*. I offer these preliminary remarks now to prepare my readers for the full—almost verbal—criticism which is given in the *Résumé* and *Rejoinder*. It is also referred to in the *Rebutter*, in connection with his confession of the crimes here charged against him.

I will but remark now on a further proof of my charges not noticed before. The Vicar makes De Rossi say that, "*All trustworthy Hebrew MSS.*" have *Ipse*; whereas what De Rossi says is: "*Almost all Hebrew MSS.*" have *Ipse*. Again he

makes De Rossi say: "All the Chaldee paraphrases, Onkelos, etc.," have *Iipse*; whereas on the very page in Pusey from which he took his shamelessly garbled quotation, De Rossi honestly admits that there is *one* MS. of Onkelos that has *Ipsa*.

Again, my readers will notice in the quotation, that De Rossi says: "Some MSS. of the Vulgate—(that is in the text), (and) many editions of the Vulgate on the margin, before those of Sixtus and Clement," have *Iipse*. Precisely. But this is simply what Cardinal Bellarmine, though himself in favor of retaining *Ipsa*, said to Chemnitz. "I reply," writes the Cardinal, "that the Vulgate is VARIOUS here; for some Codices have *Iipse*, some *Ipsa*, and besides IT IS NOT CONTRARY TO THE VULGATE EDITION should one be convinced that he ought to read *Iipse* or *Ipsum*."

The gigantic intellect of Bellarmine, a most devout and enthusiastic believer in the Immaculate Conception 300 years before its dogmatic definition, could neither see the "tremendous importance" attached to *Ipsa* by Bishop Kingdon, nor yet the "serious fundamental error" alleged by his Vicar! But then, you know, he never studied theology at Oxford, and unfortunately was born too soon to get the benefit of Little-dale's *Plain Reasons*. Get away, you Liliputs, get away, and fly into space!

R. F. Q.

LETTER I.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

BY R. F. QUIGLEY.

ST. JOHN, N. B., }
New Year's Eve., Dec. 31, 1887. }

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—Since the declination of my challenge in this matter, many duties, private and professional, have conspired to push it simply aside from my attention. This, however, I do not now regret since Bishop Kingdon's Vicar has been thereby enabled to offer another installment of his case—a tremendous, critical cataclysm as he *perhaps* thinks, and which he submits for the benefit of “Biblical students” forsooth! I am not by profession either a Biblical Exegete or Theologue, but most heartily do I on their behalf thank him for his diligence and sagacity. The threatened “further disclosures” not being thus far forthcoming, I may now charitably “hope his blunders are all out,” and that he stands up for judgment.

Here I must refer, but only parenthetically, to my opponent's statement that I have “probably had the help of learned friends” in this discussion. Characteristic surely! The petty malice of the insinuation is amusing enough, but it witnesses to such insatiable vanity, solemn self-conceit and debasing egotism that it is positively pitiful. These weaknesses blind him to the fact that such an assertion is an unconscious tribute to the logic and force of an argument which a Bishop and a *soi-disant* “priest” are incapable of answering. I accept the tribute for the sake of the honor done to the truth which I espouse, but the simple fact is I have received no help from friends learned or unlearned, directly or indirectly. I asked no help, I needed none; and with the exception of a verification or two, I have relied entirely upon my own library. But

he does not believe in the truth of his own statement. Theological charlatan and religious dwarf that he is, he perched on the shoulders of the "armed strong man" of the Protestant prejudice against the Blessed Mother of our Redeemer, which he himself admits, and adopting the Chinese method of warfare, charged upon me with shield aloft, bearing the beast with seven heads and ten horns, with outcries and shouts of derision and vituperation, of "idolatry," "impiety," and "blasphemy." I thought the height from which he had fallen so frenzied him that he became profoundly unconscious of all demands of logical argumentation. Nevertheless, I offered to meet him on the public platform, where "the help of learned friends" would not avail me, but he threw his shoes into the air and took to flight, because he could "see nothing to be gained by doing so." A lawn tennis set he thinks more entertaining and *diverting*! Well, I shall be the last to dispute the correctness of his judgment.

Now, I suppose, at any rate, I hope, that this writer has his serious moments. His last letter gave *some* evidence of such. In Cardinal Newman's phrase I wish "to appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober." I propose, therefore, to examine the strictures made by him, in his series of letters, upon my first letter, so far as they are relevant to the points at issue, and I am now perforce obliged to consider Bishop Kingdon as speaking in and through him, and consequently inculcated¹ with him. Meeting my opponents with visor up I shall not hesitate to deal blows direct and heavy, and to indulge in such severity of comment as I think their errors at once so extreme and grotesque, imperatively demand. I am, of course, aware that with a certain class of my Protestant fellow-citizens in such a matter as this there is one obligation of honesty and decorum imposed on a Catholic and quite another on a Protestant. The latter may freely use invective, cowardly insinuation, perversions of meaning, vague declamation, insult and scurrillity, and the like appliances of a worthless cause, or a worthless advocate; the former must manifest towards his opponents a sweetness of disposition and temper almost angelic. Charges of "idolatry," "impiety" and blasphemy may

be made against us; men with pretensions to learning, with character and reputation to maintain, and with a cause to advocate, may repeat all the exploded calumnies and publications of frenzied fanatics against the Catholic church, yet we may not hurl them back with indignant defiance. From pulpit and platform, theological and literary peddlars may level against us the most sweeping and crushing accusations, in their crass ignorance draw the most atrocious pictures of our doctrines and religious practices, misrepresent and falsify the Catholic creed in every particular, and to many Protestant minds "everything is lovely." We are not men, we have not characters to lose, we have not feelings to be wounded, we have not friends; we have nothing personal about us, we are not the fellow-creatures of our accusers, we are not gentlemen, we are not Christians; and yet in spite of such provocation, in the "*style polite and polished*," in candor, generosity, honorable feeling, in manly and noble bearing towards our Protestant neighbors and straightforwardness in our dealings with them, we must simply surpass them as much as the Cedars of Lebanon outgrow the little shrubs before we get credit for the attributes of ordinary human beings. But enough. I hope I am, as I ever have been, too philosophic, too magnanimous, built on too broad a scale mentally at least, too impervious to the unbecoming, the indecorous, the petty and miserable, to be irritated or dispirited at being called names, or being treated with injustice or contumely for my religion's sake. Betimes it must be no mean tonic spiritual and intellectual. Thus much am I let to say in standing off for the first time before my opponent and taking a death grip of him, of course metaphorically speaking. It will serve to introduce the main subject and to clear the ground. I make to him no irenicon, nor will I pretend to exhibit a chivalrous courtesy to one who can play such shabby tricks with the sacred memory of our Mother.

I now charge against him that his attempted defense of Bishop Kingdon is a glaring and undeviating misrepresentation of the true position of the question—a gross, unpardonable and dishonest attempt to shift the ground measured for the lists in my critique on the Bishop's statement, and the

most boldly and impudently illogical shuffling I have ever known. Thus I begin, and I hold myself bound by the sacredness of my manhood and her honor who gave it me to make good my indictment.

To recapitulate then. Seeing it announced in the papers that Bishop Kingdon would lecture on "Misprints," I bought a ticket and took a seat a few feet from the lecturer in the public hall. The lecture was illustrated, so to speak. The words commented as "Misprints"—mostly Greek and Latin—were exhibited in large letters on sheets of paper attached to a large framework or blackboard. On one sheet were the two words "IPSE—IPSA," placed one above the other. After the lecturer had spoken about three-quarters of an hour on different "Misprints," he said substantially as follows: "Hitherto the errors or misprints of which I have spoken have been of no great importance, practically speaking; but I now come to one which *in these times* has been the cause of grave errors. Here (pointing to the sheet containing the words "IPSE—IPSA") by a misprint of the letter "a" for the letter "e" there lamentably resulted, that *thirty-three years ago* the Roman Catholic Church was led to promulgate the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. The GLOBE's report was as follows: "*Sometimes the substitution of one letter for another made a vast difference, and as an illustration of this he referred to the words IPSE and IPSA, the latter word in an important passage in the Douay Bible being the foundation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.*" We substantially agree on the Bishop's statement. He offered no argument in support of it. He said St. Bernard favored IPSA, but that while he was a "very devout soul," he was altogether "unreliable"! Had the Bishop stopped here his hearers might have fairly inferred that he meant to say St. Bernard was not an authority on Textual criticism, but he went on to prove the Saint's unreliability in such matters by saying that he prophesied a successful issue for a crusade which turned out disastrously! Wonderful logic! It reminded me of a school-boy speaking of Newton or Herschel as dunces in mathematics, or a blooming freshman after wading through Aldrich or Whately, speaking of Kant or

Hegel, St. Thomas Aquinas or Aristotle, as grossly deficient in their knowledge of logical science! I could not contain my astonishment and amazement at the Bishop's statement, that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was in any way connected with or dependent upon a choice between IPSE and IPSA, such a dispute, if one, being absolutely irrelevant, and *on the spot immediately after the lecture* I protested to the secretary of the lecture committee against the incorrectness and unfairness of the Bishop's statement. Writing to the GLOBE a day or two afterwards I characterized it as "wholly incorrect and baseless." The first dishonesty my opponent commits is in connecting these words of mine with the question of "misprint," whereas, it is evident I used them to describe the Bishop's statement that the Immaculate Conception was founded on such, even assuming that a "misprint," could be made out.

Now, I do not propose that there shall be any doubt about the truth of this matter or about my view of the Bishop's position. "Mr. Quigley has impugned Bishop Kingdon's scholarship," says my opponent. That is just it. I do so, and most emphatically, and I characterize it as simply *slovenly* in this particular at least. This I consider mild to begin with. Much ought to depend on the Bishop's *animus*. As I have proved before, and will directly repeat, the Bishop is absolutely without a leg to stand on. Now, what was the drift and intention of his assertion? Was it the result of pure ignorance of what he was talking about, such as led Dr. Johnson to define "Pastern" as "the knee-joint of the horse," or was it a desire to commend himself to an audience naturally indeed fair and generous in their instincts, but educated in traditions and prejudices which predisposed them to credit the wildest charges against "Popery"; or did he come there with his diagram in his pocket prepared, and with malice aforethought, to attack the Catholic church and more especially in the honor paid by her to Our Blessed Lady? He can have his choice. He has stood by his Vicar and must be taken to adopt his line of thought and defense—perhaps, indeed, he gave the *innocent* the unfortunate extract, that edgetool from De Rossi! So

at least I opine. I will see that he gets all the comfort possible out of it.

Again: I accused the Bishop of suppressing the real state of the question on which he undertook to speak. I repeat it. The real dispute, such as it is, is between *Ipse*, *Ipsa* and *IPSUM*. There is no place for any question of "misprint." Such a designation of what is involved in this three-fold reading is wholly improper. It is simply a VARIOUS READING and fortunately like "many hundred thousand, probably upwards of a million of such" contained in Kennicott and De Rossi's Bible, absolutely insignificant, because it does not affect the sense. Did the Bishop know the real state of the question, or was he bent only on making a point against the Catholic Church, and discrediting the truth of the Immaculate Conception before an audience not more than six of whom knew what that doctrine was? I do not think the Bishop himself knows to this very hour. I never met a Protestant clergyman who did know it before I had explained it to him. So great a man as the illustrious Prof. Agassiz, of Harvard University, did not know it until I explained it to him one day. He was delivering a course of scientific lectures—strongly anti-Darwinian—on "The Natural foundation of Zoological Affinity," and one day he was discussing "Embryology." The audience in the gallery of the Museum was a distinguished one. Longfellow, with other noted *litterateurs*, was there. While speaking of a fact in connection with Bee-culture, discovered in Germany by the observations of Pastor Dzierzon, he suddenly stopped and said that "he never faced this fact without being reminded of the Church dogma of the Immaculate Conception." Even now I remember the scene so distinctly! I could not see where the Immaculate Conception, as I understood it, came in, and trying to think it out I heard little of the closing part of the lecture. I was not satisfied. Though studying law I lived in Divinity Hall quarters, and was thus brought into daily contact with the ablest Unitarian theological scholars of the United States resident at Harvard and those who visited there—Clarke, Hale, Bellows, Savage, Brooke, Bartol and others—notoriously the best educated Protestant clergy in the

world. I knew Agassiz's statement would evoke discussion, and I felt bound to get at the bottom of the Prof.'s thought before meeting my theological friends. I called at his room and the great Naturalist talked the matter over with me with the simplicity and condescension of a child. He simply did not know anything at all about the "dogma of the Immaculate Conception," as taught by the Catholic Church. What he meant was the Miraculous Conception of Christ—the Incarnation—and the physiological fact he referred to was a scientific tribute to its truth. As I had anticipated, the discussion came up, but my case was won before it commenced. Agassiz had been misunderstood through his loose or careless use of theological terms, with which like so many scientists of to-day he had not made himself familiar, but my friends had their compensation, for they learned what the Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was. And so may it be in this present case! "Learned and devout men stumble at this doctrine because in matter of fact they do not know what we mean by the Immaculate Conception." So said Cardinal Newman to Dr. Pusey when answering his famous "*Eirenicon*" of 1864, and pointing out to him his ignorance of the matter. I am convinced, that the "ninety-and-nine" of religiously-minded Protestants who learn what this thrillingly beautiful and sublime truth is will say at least what some have said to me—"Well, it ought to be true." But this incidentally.

To return: For the sake of convenience I here set down again *Genesis* iii. 15, according to the different versions. Protestant version: *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; IT shall bruise thy head, etc.*; Douay version: *I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; SHE shall crush thy head, etc.*; the Vulgate: *Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, et semen tuum et semen illius; IPSA conteret caput tuum, etc.* And just here in my first letter I expressed myself with the most careful and unexceptionable distinctness. "THIS WHOLE TEXT" or verse I said "*has been called by the early writers in the Church the Proto-Gospel because it contains the first promise of a future Savior. It is, therefore, to*

Protestant and Catholic alike of transcendent importance and very comprehensive application." Now, this statement about "THE WHOLE TEXT" or verse is very clear, and I ask the careful attention of my readers to it. I then proceed to say: "BUT IT WILL BE OBSERVED THAT THE PRESENT CONTENTION IS OVER THE FIRST WORD OF THE SECOND CLAUSE ONLY; IT *shall bruise thy head, etc.*; SHE *shall crush thy head, etc.*" To this I now add the other reading: "HE *shall bruise thy head, &c.,*" not adopted by either the Douay or Authorized Protestant Version, but common enough and recognized and established equally with the other two—"SHE" and "IT."

Here is the ring bolt of the whole matter! "The first word of the second clause only"—this is "the ground measured off for the lists." This is the thing discussed by the Bishop, and to that I have confined myself and propose to chain my opponent. Our readers will see that his vague declamations, his miserable fallacies, his wretched sophistries and fanfaronades are but the necessary result of his barefaced, cowardly and dishonest ignoring and malicious putting aside of my most definite and emphatic explanations right here, and that they run through his whole attempted defence of the Bishop and the attack on the Catholic church he made on his own account. How becoming in a "true Catholic (Caw-tholic) Christian"!

LETTER II.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—How does the question stand then? While a great many important things are daily discussed in the columns of the GLOBE, it is hardly the place to test by collation a thousand or two Hebrew, Greek and Latin MSS. Kennicott's magnificent Hebrew Bible alone gives nearly *seven hundred*!¹ Critico-

¹ I have examined this work in Harvard University Library.

Biblical disquisitions and deep linguistic athletics and exegesis are out of place here. We can reach such practical conclusions as we require without them. The question is not *absolutely* which of these *three* readings Moses used in Genesis—that may never be *proved* this side of eternity; but are there *three* and are they and have they been in use and recognized?

It is admitted on all hands that the Hebrew text, the fountain-head, such as we have it now, is hopelessly ambiguous. The learned Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius are my authority. (*I will refer later to what my opponent says about the determining effect of the masculine verb.* ABSOLUTE FEARLESSNESS IS MY MOTTO!) In consequence of this ambiguity, these *three different readings* prevailed among *ecclesiastical writers* as follows: IPSE *conteret caput tuum*—HE (Christ) shall bruise thy head; IPSA *conteret caput tuum*—SHE (the woman, the Blessed Virgin, by and through the power of her seed, Christ) shall crush thy head; IPSUM *conteret caput tuum*—IT (her seed, that is Christ) shall bruise thy head.

Here let me add an interesting fact. I do not forget what was done by the venerable Bede (died A.D. 735), and the good and great Catholic King Alfred (died 901 A.D.), to translate the Bible into the English tongue. Bede died while dictating his translation of the last verses of St. John's Gospel, and Alfred is credited in later tradition with having been a translator of the whole Bible. Smith's *Dict. of Bible*, Art. *Auth. Vers.*, p. 1665. The Ormulum, too, is a specimen of the work done in this direction. John Wycliffe, D.D., the English Heresiarch, and lovingly called "The Morning Star of the Reformation" by the compatriots and blood-relations in religion of my opponents, died exactly *five hundred and three years ago* TO-DAY! Some time before the Immaculate Conception and before the Douay translation of the Bible in 1582 and 1609! He gave to the world the year before he died an English version of the whole Bible—perhaps the first *complete* translation into English. Dr. Roberts, member of the New Testament Company of Revisers, says "it is possessed of great merit." And Wycliffe's Version has this clause of our text as follows: "SHE *shall tread thy head.*" My opponent will

probably say Wycliffe was an old *ignoramus*, did not know Hebrew, and more especially had not seen the quotation from De Rossi—"the *famous living Italian Roman Catholic scholar of Coiacombó celebrity!*" How complimentary he can be to Catholic scholarship when he thinks it suits him! It is so profound!

My opponent admits the readings "IPSE" and "IPSA," but in his death throes, grasping at a straw, puts me to proof of the existence of the neuter form "IPSUM." I admit this is my case—the burden of proof is mine, and I accept it cheerfully. I will not let him go from the bolt on which he is impaled until I excoriate him—till he feels that in an evil hour he forgot the *ethos* of his religious "school," and came to the succor of a Bishop, though probably it was not through very profound reverence for the Episcopal Office.

But to the proof. The celebrated Jesuit commentator, Cornelius à Lapide (who died in 1637—*some time before the Immaculate Conception was defined*—1854 was that date), commenting on the words "IPSA conteret caput tuum—SHE shall crush thy head," says—(I translate): "The reading here is three-fold. The first is that of the Hebrew Codices which have '*Ipsum*'—'It,' to wit, *the seed* shall bruise thy head, and so reads St. Leo (the Great, Pope and Doctor of the church, died 461, I add), and after him Lipomanus. The second is 'IPSE'—'HE' (Christ or man) shall crush thy head. So the Septuagint and Chaldaic. The third is 'IPSA'—'SHE' shall crush thy head. So the Roman Bible and almost all the Latins read with St. Augustine (the Latin translator of), Chrysostom, Ambrose, Gregory (the Great), Bede, Alcuin, Bernard, Eucherius, Rupert and others." So much at present from à Lapide on *the three readings*. I wish to confine myself first, exhaustively and overwhelmingly to the proof of "IPSUM," or the neuter form, which I also find as "Hoc"—"THIS, *the seed*," both simple pronouns of the same class, "*Hoc*" being the more emphatic.

My next witness is Kemnitzius, or Chemnitz (according to modern spelling), probably the ablest Lutheran theologian of the period immediately succeeding Luther himself (1522–1586). In his greatest work, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, he says:

"We should read *Ipsum conteret caput tuum*, It shall bruise thy head, seeing it was spoken of the seed, which was Christ, as ancient writers teach." I take this from Ward's "*Errata of the Protestant Bible*," a work of the very highest authority. Ward himself was a man of marvellous linguistic attainments and an unfortunate "pervert to Rome." However, I believe when he "came over" he was really quite sane, and in this respect, at all events, differed from those *drivelling idiots*, Faber, Newman, Manning, the Wilberforces, Allies, Mivart, the Harpers, Oakeley, Clarke, Shipley, the Bowdens, Caswall, Dalgairns, Ryder, Coleridge, Ward of the "Dublin Review," the only man in England John Stuart Mill feared or was influenced by. There are a few other *dolts* of the same capacity as Ripon, Bute, and Hope-Scott, whom the church is tenderly matronizing and 'tis thought they will recover. This by the way. Chemnitz's arguments for "IPSUM" are quoted by Cardinal Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei* (*Lib. 2, Cap. 12, 13, 14*). Was I not correct in saying that the Protestant reading "IT" came from a Hebrew, Greek or Latin neuter gender? "Our translators," the "English translators," "the English version," my opponent says, speaking of the "Protestant Version"—he scorns the word "Protestant" evidently, and will have none of it! He writhes and squirms to clear himself from its hated folds. He likes it as little as *one* is said to like Holy Water! The translators of the Protestant version certainly did not adopt the masculine "HE," and if they did not reject it, as I claimed and asserted, how did they get "IT" from the Greek masculine *autos*, if they followed my opponent's version of the Septuagint? This is too clear to need a word more.

Again, the Catholic and "Historic Dublin Review," Sept., 1856, has a great article reviewing the Jesuit Professor Passaglia's wonderful work on "The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God," published the year after the definition of the Immaculate Conception. The learned writer says (p. 161), "the weight of authority is in favor of the *masculine* or *neuter*, 'IPSE' or 'IPSUM,'" and he cites: *Passaglia, Par. 2, p. 916 et seq.*; *Melchior Canus, De Locis Theologicis, Lib. 2, Cap. 15*;

De Rubeis in App. de Var. Lect. V. T., p. 207, seq. Vol. 4, and Cardinal Patrizi's great work, "*De Immaculata Mariæ Origine a Deo prædicta Disquisitio. Romæ, 1853.*" Two Dominicans and two Jesuits! Does it not bring a blush of indignation to the cold, pale cheek of logic and truth, to hear an Anglican Bishop backed up by a PURITANICAL SYNCRETIST cyeleped "Priest," declare that "IPSA" is a misprint, that the Immaculate Conception is founded upon it, and that all sorts of idolatries and impious jugglery have been and are being wrought by it—and here we have two great Jesuit priests, in the shallowest convolution of whose brain the Bishop and his Vicar might be stowed away—we have these two—one of whom, Passaglia, was called "the Theologian of the Immaculate Conception"—declaring, one *before* the definition of the dogma, and the other *after*, that "IPSA" had nothing at all to do with it, but that "IPSE" or "IPSUM," critically speaking, was a more correct reading!!! O for a few hours before a New Brunswick Pan-Anglican Synod to discuss the Prerogatives, Dignity and Relation to her Divine Son of the ever Immaculate, Glorious, and Sublime Virgin Mother, with Passaglia and Patrizi, "St. Liguori" and "The Raccolta" on the table!

Have I not proved the existence and currency of the reading "IPSUM"? A little more, however. Dr. Pusey was "kicking up some shines" in 1864 (the "*Eirenicon*" period), and getting off some of those inconsequent utterances for which he was so fatuously famous in his later years, and in this very connection. The *Dublin Review*, then Cardinal Wiseman's organ, had an article on "The Blessed Virgin and Apostolic Tradition," in which *Genesis* iii. 15, occurred. In a note at the bottom of the page, the writer (was it Wiseman?) says: "*It makes no difference, whatever, to the force of the Protevangelium, as an argument for Mary's exaltation, whether we read 'IPSA' or 'IPSUM,' which latter we ourselves believe to be the true reading. Let Dr. Pusey, therefore, not raise an outcry which has no meaning.*" I shall invoke this later, my readers. Please keep it sharply in mind.

Now for a nightcap for the Bishop and his Vicar! I hold

in my hand "*BIBLIA SACRA sive Testamentum Vetus ab Im. Tremellio et Fr. Junius ex Hebraeo Latine redditum et Testamentum Novum a Theod. Beza e Graeco in Latinum Versum*:" The Holy Bible or Old Testament rendered into Latin from the Hebrew by Emmanuel Tremellius and Francis Junius and the New Testament translated from Greek into Latin by Theodore Beza." Tremellius and Junius were professors at Heidelberg (the former a converted Jew), and they brought out their Old Testament at Frankfort, in 1597. This is the Version from which the courteous Mr. Campbell quoted, and I am happy to give him this information in lieu of the "fitting reply" which the Bishop failed to make to my indictment. He has my sympathy in his disappointment! In this Bible the clause in question runs thus: "*Hoc conteret tibi caput*:" THIS (the seed) shall bruise thy head"—as good as any can desire—as good as "IPSE," "IPSA," or "IPSUM." "This translation is preferred by the English Protestants," says a high authority—Rev. Alban Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, vol. 3, p. 804, N., and this alone may account for "IT" in the Protestant Version.

Again, refer to the annotations to the Douay Bible on this text, and what do you find? "IPSA" or "IPSUM," and the remark: "*The sense is the same; for it is by her seed, Jesus Christ, that the woman crushes the serpent's head.*"

I think our readers will now concede that I have proved my case so far as "IPSUM" goes, and answered my opponent's question. I can better this; but "enough is as good as a feast." My opponent admits the existence and currency of "IPSE" and "IPSA," and I presume we can now treat "IPSE," "IPSA," and "IPSUM" as more or less authorized readings. Alas! now, for the Bishop's little diagram of "*Ipsa—Ipsa*," and his silly story in connection with it. It reminds me of that well-known method in German philosophy: first set things on their heads, and then amuse yourself at seeing them unable to walk! I wonder if the Bishop is an adept?

And now an independent word on "IPSA," supererogatory indeed, so far as the necessities of my argument stand, but yet furnishing a peg for some *tattooing* remarks. I confess

this is to me an enticing part of the discussion. It brings to mind the grand old Vulgate of the Catholic Church, whose history would require a small volume. Its text is a composite, eclectic one, so to speak, formed by the fusion of the old Italic and Latin versions in use in the Western Church before St. Jerome, and Jerome's translation. It needs no apology from me, for it remains to-day the most important means at our command for the final settlement of many critical questions connected with the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. This is the testimony of the ablest Protestant critics—Grotius, Cappell, Mills, Walton, Roberts, and others. "Jerome's old Vulgate," says my opponent, "made direct from the Hebrew, has the masculine 'Ipse'—the modern Vulgate in spite of this has 'IPSA.'" Yes, but he overlooks the fact that the reading "IPSA" of the present Vulgate is older than St. Jerome's reading "IPSE." *When, therefore, my opponent says that "the translators of the modern Vulgate," as he calls them, "are without excuse in adopting 'IPSA,' more especially as they had the grand old Vulgate of St. Jerome before their eyes to keep them right,"* he talks arrant nonsense. He puts the cart before the horse. 'Tis St. Jerome who is, in this particular, without excuse for attempting to make the change from "IPSA" to "IPSE"; and St. Augustine, his great friend, and St. Ambrose, two giants (with others mentioned above by Cornelius à Lapide) told him so, and refused to give up their old love "IPSA" for St. Jerome's "IPSE," and they have been sustained down to this very hour. In this connection let me state a remarkable fact, with an interesting episode, showing the relation of the present Vulgate, as well to the Old Italic or Vulgate and its sources, as to St. Jerome's Vulgate, and showing, too, the tenor of tradition in affecting and determining that relation.

The Greek word *epiousios*—meaning "*daily*," the Latin "*Quotidianum*,"—is found in the New Testament only in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, as given both by St. Matthew vi., ii., and St. Luke xi. 3. The Old Latin Version translates *epiousios* by "*quotidianum—daily*," in both Gospels, and it is rendered "*daily*" in both Gospels in the Protestant Version. When St. Jerome revised the Latin of the New Testa-

ment, he substituted "supersubstantialem—supersubstantial" for "quotidianum—daily" in St. Matthew, but apparently in doubt about his correctness he left "quotidianum—daily" in St. Luke, and so it stands in the Vulgate to-day and in the Douay translation. But the "quotidianum—daily" of the old Latin maintained, and still maintains, its place in the church service book and offices, in the Liturgies—Roman, Gallican, Ambrosian and Mozarabic—in the celebrated catechism of the Council of Trent even, and in the private devotions of Catholics to-day. They know no other, I may say. It is the remnant of a Version older than St. Jerome's, as "Ipsa" is such another remnant, and although Jerome's revision in this particular is the reading of the Vulgate to-day, it has been powerless to displace the ante-Jerome "quotidianum—daily." I ought to point out that both words appear together in that inexpressibly beautiful Post-Communion prayer of St. Bonaventure, beginning: "Transfige Dulcis sime Domine Jesu," etc. The application here, however, is purely Eucharistic and refers solely to the holy and adorable Sacrament of the altar.

Anent these words a tilt took place between Abelard and St. Bernard. The Saint having occasion to visit the convent of the Paraclete, of which Heloise was Abbess, observed that in repeating the Lord's prayer at the daily hours a change was made in the usual form, the word "supersubstantialem" being substituted for "quotidianum" in St. Matthew's gospel. St. Bernard forbade Heloise to adopt the former word. As Heloise had made this change under the direction of Abelard, she told him of the prohibition, and thereupon Abelard wrote a letter of defense to St. Bernard, which is extant. The result was that the innovation was disallowed, and "quotidianum—daily" once more rang through the cloisters of the Paraclete. See Canon Lightfoot on Revision, etc. "IPSA" is the reading of the Vulgate to-day—"the best Version of all those that have come down to us from antiquity." These are the words of Scott Porter; Canon Westcott, in Smith's "Dict. of the Bible," is almost as strong, and they are certainly confirmed by the action of the Protestant Revisers a little while ago. They made several startling corrections in accordance with the

Vulgate. Let me give a very important one—they have restored the true reading of 1 Cor. xi. 27. For 200 years, to fasten on Catholics the charge of “mangling the sacrament,” as they put it, they read this text conjunctively: “Whosoever shall eat the bread *and* drink the cup, etc.” This they did to infer a necessity and obligation for the laity as for the priest to communicate under both kinds, as the conjunctive “*and*” may seem to do. The Revisers have done an act of justice to Catholics by restoring the true reading—“*or drink,*” and thus removed a corruption which Dean Stanley owned was due “to theological fear or partiality.” Other great tributes to the Vulgate I cannot stay to chronicle now, without expanding the letter too much.

This is not, as I said before, the place to argue nice questions of Textual Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics, but I cannot allow some very crude and shallow statements of my opponent to pass without correction. He must admit, that it is now absolutely impossible to determine from the Hebrew text direct, without merely spelling it out and, as he thinks inferentially, whether the pronoun is masculine, feminine, or neuter. This I have already proved by the testimony of Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius. There can be no stronger. *We have no Hebrew text older than the 9th century.* My opponent, however, labors to show that because the verb “*conteret*” is masculine, therefore the pronoun is masculine, and that settles the whole thing. Silly nonsense! Somebody must have told him this in a joke! What sort of studies has he made in Textual Criticism within the last thirty years? Giants in scholarship have tried to determine this very point, and have so far failed. Why should Liliputs presume! He ought to know that it is common in the Hebrew Scriptures, idiomatic, indeed, in certain cases, to have pronouns and verbs of the masculine gender joined with nouns of the feminine, as in Ruth i. 8; Esther ii. 20; Eccles. xii. 15. Again, there are in the Pentateuch several places in which the masculine pronoun is used instead of the feminine, although the antecedent is a noun feminine; and this construction, I read, occurs so frequently that there is every reason to believe that it proceeded

from the original author of the Books. See Kennicott's Bible *in loco* for the authorities touching the two celebrated texts: Genesis xx. 5, and Genesis xxiv. 44; also Porter's Bib. Criticism. I speak on authority, of course, as I do not know Hebrew well enough to set up my own judgment. But I refer the Bishop and his Vicar to Cornelius à Lapide, as above quoted, where they will find a critical and exegetical discussion on this grammatical point, eminently *jesuitical*, in the true literal sense of the term, that may somewhat enlarge their now apparently very contracted intellectual horizon. A LAPIDE concludes his argument thus (I translate): "WHEREFORE IT SEEMS TO ME THAT MOSES IN THE HEBREW HERE JOINED A MASCULINE VERB WITH A FEMININE PRONOUN, SAYING HI'ASCUPH, 'IPSA CONTERET—SHE SHALL CRUSH,' TO SIGNIFY THE WOMAN AS WELL AS HER SEED, AND SO THAT THE WOMAN BY AND THROUGH HER SEED, TO WIT, BY CHRIST, SHOULD CRUSH THE HEAD OF THE SERPENT." Now I am familiar with the critical literature in Greek and Latin touching all these three respective readings, and so profoundly convinced am I (catching, as I think I do, the very quintessence of the idea involved in the first clause of the text), that Moses wrote the feminine pronoun, that I will discuss the matter with the Bishop before a committee of Protestant clergymen in this city—say the Reverend Doctors Bennet, Pope, and Macrae, if these gentlemen will pardon my using their names—and at such time as may be arranged, when I will undertake to maintain that position. I can lay claim, indeed, to no special spiritual perception or illumination on such a matter, but there is to my mind a higher criterion of genuineness than MS. authority. There is what Griesbach calls an "interna bonitas"; there is what Bengel calls an "adamantina cohaerentia," which, he says, speaking of a matter very like this, "compensate for the scarcity of MSS." These words are almost untranslatable.

But I hear some one ask: What about the appalling critico-cyclonic cataclysm on "Ipse" from De Rossi, whom my opponent describes as "A famous living Italian Roman Catholic scholar of catacomb-inscription celebrity?" Ye Gods! Is it true, then, that whom you would destroy you first make mad?

Has this writer no friends—"learned friends" of course I mean, who, if they cannot help him, might save him from—*himself*? Verily "an enemy hath done this!" Has Bishop Kingdon "sold" his friend? Or can I trust mine eyes? Will it now be wondered at that, profoundly distrusting the honesty of this writer, I sought to meet him face to face before my fellow-citizens, where I could unmask his presumptuous pretentiousness, his little shifts and miserable subterfuges, and hold him up to the piercing gaze of every man who values truth more than empty semblance of victory, honesty more than mere vainglorious triumph over an opponent? I believed him to be a master in the art of suppression and misstatement, and, therefore, I preferred "the limited area of the Institute" which he so pathetically deprecated, the "Fifty Years of Europe"—"the audience fit though few" before whom castigation for dishonesty would be administered on the spot. I am magnanimous enough, however, to say that the religious position of a ritualistic minister, so-called, is intellectually simply so contemptible that honesty in a matter like this is too much to expect.

LETTER III.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—Here is a writer steeped to the lips in vanity and self-conceit, signing himself "Priest of the Mission church" (and I am told an Oxford graduate), anxious to instruct "Biblical students," barefacedly pretending to speak with knowledge of and to quote from a learned work which he evidently never saw, and about which he by his own confession—*habemus confitentem reum*—knows absolutely nothing! No, not even the name of the author! Good Heaven! The great and saintly Father John Bernard De Rossi, of Parma, "the last of the Tribunes" of that period in Sacred Criticism brought back

from Heaven and by a new ritualistic theory of Metempsychosis transformed into the great Catholic Archæologist, Commentatore G. B. De Rossi, now at Rome, aged about sixty-five!—and this by the “Priest of the Mission church!” Oh, no! Thaumaturgist though he fain would be thought, he cannot hope to do what the Pope and the whole college of cardinals could not do! The humble Priest and Professor, the learned Hebraist, the pet and pride and darling of Pope Pius VI. and all Europe for his Biblical scholarship, who spent his life and fortune in collecting MSS. and rare editions of the Hebrew texts, for which the Emperor of Russia, in vain, offered him an enormous price, and which Pius VI. delicately proposed to buy for the Vatican, but which De Rossi bequeathed to the library of his native city,—to attempt to rob him of all his glory, and by the “Priest of the Mission church!” Fie! O Fie! I may well say to him with Prince Hal: “What trick, what device, what starting hole canst thou now find out to hide thee from this open and apparent shame?” To conscientious readers of these letters I say: Thrust this shuffling witness out of court, and if you seriously wish to know the teachings of the Catholic church on any question, go to some duly accredited exponent of her doctrine, and not to a man who has shown himself to be one of those of whom St. Leo observes in forcible terms that “they have made themselves makers of error because they would not become the disciples of truth.” To “Biblical students” let *me* say that De Rossi published this volume just *one hundred years ago this very year*, as an *appendix* to Dr. Kennicott’s great Hebrew Bible, and a fifth volume in 1798–9 and *he died in 1831*. Now, if it in the remotest way affected my position, or the state of the question at issue, I could not safely accept a quotation from De Rossi by my opponent—I would not trust him. But it just plays my hand—it establishes by strong evidence the currency of the third reading, “Ipse.” This was a part of my case—to establish the *fact* of *three readings*, not *two only* as the Bishop and his Vicar alleged.

Let me dispose of De Rossi while I have him in hand. My opponent quotes him as saying: “The masculine reading is better, by which the bruising of the serpent is ascribed *imme-*

diately and *alone* to the Seed of the woman, and from which the redemption, power and divinity of the Messiah are plainly elicited." Perfectly Catholic doctrine, and exactly my position stated in my first letter and repeated often in this. Where does the comfort for my opponent and the Bishop come in? The masculine reading may be, *verbally* and *critically* speaking, the best—we are not now discussing that—and, no doubt, this is what De Rossi meant, and clearly enough said, too, had we his words before us in the original; for as I shall make very clear directly, whether we read *IPSE*, *IPSA* or *IPSUM*, the result and meaning is absolutely the same—that is to say, the bruising or crushing of the serpent is ascribed *immediately* and *alone* to Christ, and *its whole significance for us comes from His Redemption, Power and Divinity*. This is the pure Catholic doctrine with which I have all through *scalded* my opponents; and will anybody believe that the *genuine* "*Father*" De Rossi did not know it and hold it, too? Yes, thank God! A Priest of the Catholic Church can never publicly deny her tenets and at the same time claim to be in full communion with her, and to teach doctrines whose true and logical home, if they are worth anything at all, is *elsewhere*! Can I point out to the writer in clearer terms the contradictions and confusion in which he involves himself, and those who fatuously follow him, by persisting in his concentrated calumnies against the Catholic Church and her teaching in this particular? But more anon.

Again De Rossi is quoted: "The present reading of the Vulgate ought to be amended by the authority of the church." Good Catholic sentiment again! I had already anticipated it when I said, *in my first letter*, that "I as a Catholic have no more interest in retaining '*IPSA*'—*SHE* in the text than he (Bishop Kingdon) has, so far as the Immaculate Conception is concerned, and that if it be found that '*IT*' or '*HE*' and not '*SHE*' is the true reading the correction will no doubt be made." De Rossi's words just quoted very well interpret and explain his view of the whole matter, and put it exactly in accord with "the pure Catholic doctrine" spoken of above. The proud boast of the Catholic church is that in matters of doc-

trine affecting God's sacred truth she is *semper eadem*—To-day, Yesterday and Forever the same. Will anyone believe that a veritable and loyal priest of that church, in suggesting a merely verbal change in a certain document in her custody, meant to charge her with doctrinal error which he proposed to correct by the change? Bah! Tell that to the marines. De Rossi, as a learned priest, knew quite well, as we do now, that his proposed change made no difference *in the sense*, but as a stickler for critical nicety and absolute, literal correctness, merely for its own sake, he hoped the church, in which he expressly recognized the power, would make the change. Now Bible revision is not made every day in the church of God for a merely verbal whim, but Pius VI. might have obliged his friend De Rossi by making the change just as a delicate compliment to his great industry in collecting MSS.! It would not have made the slightest difference doctrinally speaking, and De Rossi would have been, what he no doubt was, a devout believer in the Immaculate Conception all the same, and long before it was defined; and, besides, the pardonable vanity of a pious enthusiast in merely verbal perfection would have been gratified by the Pope's adopting his proposed emendation. Pius VI., however, was not much of "a true Catholic (Catholic) Christian" anyhow, and it would appear that the good De Rossi's pet wish was not gratified, and the Vulgate remains *in statu quo*.

Anent De Rossi my opponent again says: "Here then is overwhelming evidence of the accuracy of our translators of the Bible in this particular." What must our readers think of such disgraceful muddling up of the question to be discussed? More than once have I pointed out that *we were not discussing the relative merits of readings or versions*, and yet at every turn my opponent tries his dodging and shuffling, but his Protean dishonesty will not save him from the scorn of all fair men. Now, while unfortunately for him and the Bishop the whole question over which they have made such hideous grimaces is, as I shall further re-state, the veriest verbal quillet, yet is it not the most solemn trifling with the intelligence of their readers to say that "It," the actual Protestant reading,

and "HE" are identical as *words*! Of course, I offer no criticism on the alleged quotation from De Rossi. Did the logical requirements of this argument, however, permit it, I could very interestingly discuss the value of some of the MSS. mentioned when compared with those in favor of the other two readings, IPSA and IPSUM. Such a course on my part would very properly be taken as an insult by readers who have a right to expect, and I think demand from me a logical treatment of the subject in hand.

I will bunch the balance of his last letter with the first directly.

To sum up, I have now proved beyond cavil, I think, the existence of the three readings—IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM. The controversy over them between Catholics and Protestants, learned men on both sides have long since repudiated as unmeaning and useless. It possesses interest and importance as a question of Biblical criticism only, and that of the lower kind, but it in no way affects any truth of Revelation or any matter of Catholic doctrine, because, when properly understood, the sense is the same to Catholic and Protestant alike, to the Catholic at all events, which is now the important point.

I beg my readers to keep clearly in mind that the battleground is the first word of the second clause of the text, Genesis iii. 15, to wit: HE, SHE or IT shall bruise or crush thy head.

Now my case against the Bishop and his Vicar requires, to be submergingly complete, that I prove, that according to Catholic teaching and authority there is absolutely no difference in meaning between the three readings. I have already often stated the fact. Now to the proof.

My first witness will be Cornelius à Lapide already quoted. I translate: "*Note in the first place, that none of these three readings is to be rejected; on the contrary they are all true.*"

Tirinus—Commentary on the Old and New Testament—speaks of the three readings and then says: "*Sed in idem redit*—but it amounts to the same thing."

Suarez (1617), of whom the admirable and celebrated Protestant philosopher Grotius wrote: "So profound a philosopher and

theologian that it would be hardly possible to find his equal"—Suarez says, in speaking of the *three readings*: "*Sensus tamen idem est*—Notwithstanding (the three readings) the sense comes to the same thing." The lovers of Mary in particular owe the deepest gratitude to the truly illustrious and revered name of Suarez; for the whole body of Marian doctrine has never been drawn out with a fulness and accuracy commensurable with that exhibited in his second volume on the Incarnation. Could I be fairly charged with a design or a desire "to seethe the kids in their mother's milk," if I were to recommend to the Bishop and his Vicar a brain-bath in this volume, with frequent *douches* thereafter for those parts of their cranial anatomy that remained morbidly sensitive on the quantum of honor due the Blessed Mother?

I here beg publicly to thank my dear friend and old teacher, Father Dixon of Newcastle, for the use of Suarez. He sent it me *after* he had seen my letter in the papers, and in confirmation of my position. I am glad to have an opportunity to turn it to account in this connection. He is absolutely the only "learned friend" who has bothered himself about me. Doubtless, those of them who know me think I can be safely trusted with such a theological *chore* as this.

Again: I have in my hand the great work—*De Divina Traditione et Scriptura: On Divine Tradition and Scripture*—by perhaps the greatest theologian to-day in the Church, the Jesuit Cardinal Franzelin. Touching IPSA and IPSE he says: *The truth taught by both is the same, p. 536.*

Again: Ward's *Errata* says: "Whether we read 'SHE' shall bruise, or, 'Her SEED'—that is her Son, Christ Jesus, we attribute no more, or no less to Christ, or to his Mother, by this reading or by that."

Let me add to those authorities our own Archbishop O'Brien in his marvellously beautiful little book "Mater Admirabilis." I can quote *twenty* more to same effect, but enough.

The tide has long since risen above their heads, submerged and engulfed my opponents, but I feel bound to show how outrageously wicked and malicious the Vicar can be in his disregard of all logic, and the violation of all the laws of manly

and straightforward polemic. Hitherto my criticism has been, from the exigencies of my case, mainly constructive, but hereafter I shall turn my attention to destructive work, and though the material in my path is abundant I will not loiter.

LETTER IV.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—The argument on the main question is finished, and I might here rest my case, satisfied, indeed, that I have fairly accomplished the task imposed upon me by Bishop Kingdon's wild statements, illustrated by his little diagram, and his Vicar's cachinations in support thereof. I have met my opponents—

“dareful, beard to beard,
And beat them backward home.”

The Vicar has, however, so encrusted the matter with irrelevant rubbish that might mislead the general Protestant public, and dim the clear impression I have sought to give, that I crave the patience of my readers while I disengage it from this encrustment.

Complaints have been made against me that I have been unduly severe in my language to “educated English gentlemen holding the Orders of the Church of England.” Now I said nothing about that apocryphal entity known as the “Orders of the Church of England,” but as to the “educated English gentlemen”—well, I had always been taught that education and station had their obligations—their *duties* as well as their *rights*. *Noblesse oblige*, my opponents and their apologists should remember. My walks in life have been sufficiently varied to give me some idea of ecclesiastical brawling and blackguardism in regard to the Catholic church, her teaching and her institutions. I have on my table a work of 606

pages, entitled "The Variations of Popery," by the Rev. Dr. Edgar, an Anglican clergyman in my own dear Ireland. I dip into this now and then when my brain is sluggish and in need of a tonic, when I wish to indulge in that *elan de l'esprit* which, from a merely natural and intellectual standpoint, floods my mind and heart at the very thought that I am a "Papist"—and by the pure mercy of God. But who commenced the "offensive" in this discussion? Did I not treat Bishop Kingdon with the utmost courtesy and respect? Turn to my first letter of Nov. 24th. The complaints against me well illustrate the truth of what I said early in this letter—"that there is one obligation of honesty and decorum imposed on a Catholic and quite another on a Protestant." Is it nothing, then, I ask fair-minded Protestants, that the church which I love more than my life is accused of "enormities," "impieties," "idolatries" and blasphemies, and that I am *personally* charged with "*accepting*" and practising the same? And by whom? By one of a so-called religious "school" (I cannot call it a Church) that in the face of history, in defiance of contemporary declarations on the part of the Anglican Bishops, and contemporary decisions of the Ecclesiastical Law Courts, proclaims the identity of the English Church of to-day with the Apostolic Church and the pre-Reformation Church in England, and maintains doctrines which are reprobated by the Bishops and three-fourths of the Anglican communion, and uses ceremonies which are condemned by its formularies, and prayers which are declared blasphemous and rites which are declared idolatrous! At present I refrain from illustrating these statements for my Protestant fellow-citizens by an account of what took place in London at the funeral of a leading Ritualist recently deceased. Yet in the face of all this I do not forget the Christo-centric teaching of patience and self-denial under insults, nor yet His own example in dealing with the desecrators of the Temple. He was the Prince of Peace, but I ween He sanctioned no methods for forwarding *peace* which did not uphold the supreme authority of the *truth*. I have sat at the feet of some of their ablest lecturers and teachers of Divinity, and am as familiar with the symbolic and doctrinal writings of the Prot-

estant denominations as most laymen, and I can appeal with absolute confidence to hundreds of my Protestant friends and associates when I say, that I never in my life maligned, slandered or misrepresented a Protestant creed, or *commenced* a religious discussion. I do not like religious polemic, and I have invariably acted only on the defensive, and I can again appeal to honored names among the Protestant clergy, even of this city, whose friendship I have the pleasure to claim. My motto has ever been, "Beware of entrance to a quarrel," especially a religious quarrel; however, I have just human nature enough in me to adopt the rest of this quotation: "but, being in (the quarrel), bear it that the opposed may beware of thee." I am emphatically a man of peace—but not "peace at any price." I am not content that any theological fraud or Boanerges who chooses shall by caricature, insult, calumny and outrage of Catholic belief "make a wilderness and call it peace." That would be subordinating *truth* to *peace*, and consequently traitorous. The distinction between Christ and Iscariot must be kept clear at least in matters of religion.

What I desiderate in Protestant teachers is a knowledge of the Catholic doctrines they attack. We will then have less of the wild figments of hysterical imaginations and pandemonium caricatures of beliefs in defence of which the mightiest intellects that ever adorned our race have found their highest sphere, and of which genius allied with sanctity have ever been the most persuasive and enthusiastic exponents.

In this discussion I ask no quarter from my opponents—I will give none. On them I will have no mercy, controversially speaking; and I have about as much sympathy for them as St. Paul felt for "Alexander the Coppersmith," for whom he desired "a reward according to his works." They have both maligned the Catholic church, and set off their own sect in opposition to their burlesque of her, but, nevertheless, in what I have hereafter to say, I will not "carry the war into Africa" beyond repelling their attack. Beside my opponents I have no quarrel with Anglicans or Anglicanism. There are many non-Catholic friends who will be pained by my course and my utterances in this matter. They cannot feel it more

keenly than I do, but the fault is not mine. The duty of speaking out has been cast upon me by a gross and wanton attack, wholly unprovoked in the quarter from which it came. Common justice, therefore, demands that the responsibility for unpleasantness be put on other shoulders than mine. So far as in me lies, I do not propose "to hold the truth of God in injustice." Religious systems are one thing—individuals quite another, and individual religious life I have ever regarded as the most sacred of things. I have hundreds of Protestant friends whom I respect and love, and to whom, as man to man, I am much indebted, but even in this so-called Protestant community, I want it distinctly understood I do not fear them. I will defend my religious creed when attacked, with their sympathy and approval of fair play if I can get them, but in spite of all, if I cannot. On the battle-field of pure theology, science and philosophy and not Biblical research nor mere ritualistic vagaries, must shape religious polemics in the future, for all at least who feel their responsibilities and grasp the importance of the issues.

So much have I been led to say by the criticism—written and spoken—on my style of conducting this controversy. I must now hasten to the work.

"It is much more easy," justly remarks a writer, "to catch popular approval by the brilliancy of an assault, than to command it by the steady virtues of a defence." "Error," says the Chinese proverb, "will make the circuit of the globe while Truth is pulling on her boots." An unscrupulous writer can make a statement in a half-dozen lines which it would require a volume to answer. The accusation or proposition may be short and stinging; the answer is apt to be long and dull. Everyone has felt the truth of this. Kingsley's charge, for instance, against the Catholic priesthood is contained in six and a half lines, and yet it drew from Cardinal Newman that epoch-making book, the "Apologia," which entombs Kingsley's reputation, and many other like things, for all time. To compare small things with great, it is the same here. The Bishop's Vicar has made a number of statements in his characteristically grandiose way—*hardly one of which is correct*. To make his

demolition as thorough and complete as any demolition can be, I am obliged to track him through all his sinuosities, and to expose his ignorance and recklessness, so that not one shred or tatter of truth will be left to cover his hideous nakedness. It is a wearisome affair, but truth obliges to it, and I have no choice; but I will make the journey as interesting as possible.

Now, in my first letter I said: "Of course I am not now discussing the truth of this doctrine (the Immaculate Conception), but simply correcting an amazing misconception." Here I expressly disclaimed the intention of discussing the doctrine, and I did not discuss it—such a thing was out of place then. The Bishop has stated that *IPSA* was a misprint for *IPSE*, altogether ignoring the fact that there were *three readings* in good form here. His Lordship's way of putting the question was bad enough, and disgraceful and humiliating enough as a matter of mere scholarship; but to follow it up with the statement *so minutely worded* that *thirty-three years ago* such misprint led to the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by the Roman Catholic church, was unpardonable in a man with the honors of the Anglican Episcopate fresh upon him, and thus filling a position where, according to St. Paul, it behoveth him to be "a teacher": 1 Tim. iii. 2. In my innocence of what simple ignorance, iron-clad by prejudice could do, I mildly called the Bishop's proposition "an amazing misconception." But notwithstanding St. Paul's injunction again that a Bishop "must have a good testimony from them who are without," Dr. Kingdon seemed to stick to it. It became, therefore, logically necessary to reduce the matter to charge and counter-charge. I denied point blank both of the Bishop's assertions, *as matters of fact*, and, as I think, proved my case even in my very first letter, and *before* there appeared on the scene the "Priest of the Mission Chapel," that "true Catholic (Caw-tholic) Christian," the new KEEPER-IN-ORDINARY, in this city, of the types and blocks and chromo-process from and by which Popery is ever hereafter to be printed off; the traditional fictions, sophisms, calumnies, mockeries, sarcasms and invectives with which Catholics are to be assailed. In the language of Art he has now given us a "proof copy." He no sooner

enters the lists than, having told the Bishop his statement was "too bald and unqualified," he proceeds to create an adversary for his own little "lawn tennis set," and launches into an attack upon the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, the truth of which I had not discussed at all, because, not being involved in the argument I had to make against the Bishop, I was logically bound, and by respect for the intelligence of my readers, to disclaim its discussion. He begs the question by calling *IPSA* a mistranslation, raves about "the undue exaltation of the Holy Virgin" resulting from it, and walks straight into the yawning abyss of the most degrading indifference to all logical decency, truth, and self-respect, by asserting that "Pope Pius IX. when promulgating the Dogma in S. Peter's at Rome, Dec. 8, 1854, *alluded, for its defence, to this very text.*" The italics are mine. What monstrous perversion of the truth! Has this writer become so maniacal, so satanized in his hatred of the Catholic church, and the honor given our Blessed Lady therein, as to renounce all sense of responsibility for his utterances? Cannot others read as well as he? I hold in my hand the original Latin Decree on the Immaculate Conception known as the Bull "*INEFFABILIS.*" It consists of twenty-eight sections. Let my readers remember that I asserted the importance of *this whole text*—Gen. iii. 15—to Protestants and Catholics alike and for the same reasons, altogether apart from any question about the Immaculate Conception, but I narrowed down the discussion to the *first word* of the *second clause*—*HE, SHE, or IT, shall bruise or crush thy head.* This is just where the Bishop put the matter by his statement, and this is just the very ring-bolt to which I shall hold him and his Vicar. The *first clause*—"I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed"—is outside of our discussion and altogether irrelevant to it. Yet it is the *first clause only* that is *quoted* in the Bull or Decree, and then only in a summary of Patristic teaching on the Blessed Mother! It occurs *twice* as follows,—I translate: . . . "but (God) also raised in a wonderful manner the hopes of our race, when He said: 'I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed.' They

(the Fathers) have taught that in this divine declaration was clearly and plainly showed forth the Merciful Redeemer of the human race—namely, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, &c., &c.” I translate from the Latin only enough to give the context, and I point it *exactly* as in the original. This is from the twelfth section of the Decree. Again, from the seventeenth section I translate: “Then, too, they (the Fathers) published their belief . . . that her (the Blessed Virgin’s) coming was foretold by God himself on the occasion when he said to the serpent: ‘I will put enmities between thee and the woman.’” Now this *first clause* of our text stands in the original in quotation marks *just* as I have given it and set off as that part of the text used, in both sections. And so the *first clause* is used by the great Jesuit Passaglia, called “the Theologian of the Immaculate Conception,” in his work already referred to, as well as by other eminent Catholic writers on this doctrine who have referred to this text at all. And some eminent theologians do not use in their argument for the dogma even the first clause. I have before me Hurter’s “Dogmatic Theology,” in three volumes—a work of the highest authority. The author is to-day a Professor at the University of Innsbruck, and a son of the illustrious Frederick Von Hurter, called by Sebastian Brunner “the apostolic historian of the XIXth century,” and who, though a Protestant clergyman, undertook to write and did write, in four volumes, after *twenty-four years’ labor*, the famous history of that great Pope, Innocent the Third. He got his reward even here—Faith! For St. Paul says—“*Fides est donum Dei*: Faith is the gift of God.” The profound studies and investigation attending this stupendous work led him into the fold of the Catholic church. Father Hurter’s volumes are the text-book in most of the Catholic Theological Seminaries throughout the world. In his second volume, page 387, he is discussing in his enchanting way the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and says in a note—I translate: “Mayhap some one will look for an argument drawn from Genesis iii. 15: *I will put enmities, &c.*, which text Catholic theologians freely use. *But since we do not need this argument, &c., &c., &c.*,” and he then passes

to criticisms of and suggestions about it. Now in the face of all this, even as to the use made of the *first clause* of our text in the Decree, does it not display in this Vicar an impudence and ignorance colossal in their criminality when he says that Pius IX. alluded "*to this very text*" for a defence of the doctrine! But let that pass as regards the *first clause*, with which I am not concerned in this controversy. What about the second clause, or rather its *first word*? It remains just as I have stated—indifferent to HE, SHE, or IT so far as the Immaculate Conception is concerned, or the honor paid the Mother of the Redeemer by Catholics, and absolutely without any weight or bearing, in the Vicar's sense, on the promulgation of the doctrine by the Pope. And yet in a letter to his Vicar the Bishop himself says "that the *mistake* IPSA for IPSE had acquired a tremendous importance from being quoted in the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by Pius IX." Are any words too strong to express the indignation a Catholic must feel at such an exhibition, in high places, of absurdity and silliness so gigantic in regard to his religion, and in persons who besides have the cheek and assurance to publicly criticise, slander, and malign it! Does Bishop Kingdon know Latin well enough to read the Papal Decree, and if—yes, has he read it—understandingly? I cannot believe it, because if he did he would not be such a madman as to pen such *stuff* for the public. Why, IPSA, as we are discussing it, *does not appear at all in the bull or decree!* The *second clause* of our text is not even *quoted*, properly speaking, but is only referred to indirectly, and the idea expressed paraphrastically, while the *first clause* is quoted *verbatim* and with absolute precision in quotation marks as I have given it above. Here is the strongest paraphrase of the *second clause* that occurs in the decree which I gave for the Bishop's benefit, to wit: "*Quae procul dubio venenatum ejusdem serpentis caput contrivit*: who (referring to Mary) without doubt crushed the empoisoned head of that same serpent." But this is simply the idea conveyed by the clause itself as it stands in the full text, where it is much stronger as expressed by the Almighty than when paraphrased as in the decree. Will the Bishop, or any one for him, point out

how the *words* or *ideas* even of this clause have acquired such "a tremendous importance" by appearing in the decree promulgating the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, so recently ago, when they had already been used and expressed in a stronger and more emphatic and more authoritative form if possible by the Catholic church herself in the Old Vulgate and the New for *fifteen hundred years* before an Anglican Protestant Bishop or ritualistic Vicar had been thought of—*except in the Counsels of God!* Indignation retires before the saddening pity evoked by such reflections. So far as my own personal feeling is concerned, I rather thank the Bishop and his Vicar for the delight they have given me in making or renewing my acquaintance with thoughts so elevating as those suggested and inspired by my subject-matter; but I deplore it because of the scandal given to the "little ones" of their own flocks who look to them for guidance in spiritual matters—"the little ones" who don't know! The mild-mannered and sweet-tempered good "Queen Bess," the ablest "Pope" the "Church of England, as by law established," ever had, used to say to her Bishops when they misbehaved: "Proud Prelate! I made you a Bishop and, by God, I will unmake; I will unfrock you if you don't look sharp!" Green's "Short History of the English People," p. 383, is my authority. What would she do in a case like this?

LETTER V.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—In very weariness of spirit and disgust unutterable I would turn away from this Vicar and his disreputably ignorant ravings; I could say with the impatient Hotspur:

"I had rather live
With cheese and garlick in a windmill, far,
Than feed on cates, and have *him* talk to me,
In any summer-house in Christendom."

But I am obliged to prove in detail the damning charges I have thus far maintained against him, and must, therefore, sift his every assertion. He complains, he charges that Pius IX. set up in Rome, to commemorate the promulgation of the dogma, a figure of the Blessed Virgin trampling the serpent under foot—"and without the holy child, mark you, in her arms," he emphasizes. That is, he accuses Pius IX. of excogitating out of his own brain the idea of such a figure as something brand new and manufactured *pro re nata*, for the sole purpose of memorizing the promulgation of the dogma, and he adds that "this representation . . . has been for years and still is very common among Roman Catholics." Now, notwithstanding the affectation of learning and tone of confidence of this writer when instructing the public on the "enormities," "impious acts of worship," "impious utterances," and "idolatrous devotions" of "the Roman church," his ludicrous and audacious ignorance brand him as the most gigantic fraud in this community. 'Twas a remark of an old Jesuit priest that religion suffered more from the sayings and doings of "*Pious fools*" than from any of its open and professed enemies. I have lately, in utter desperation at his fatuity, frequently asked myself if the Bishop's Vicar was one of the brotherhood! Let us see. I have already explained the Catholic meaning of the words—"SHE shall crush thy head," etc. Let me pay him the compliment of adopting, as well and fully expressing the Catholic doctrine, his own closing words in his last letter—that cataclysmal letter in which he, *only ignorantly*, I would charitably believe, tried to palm off on some of his innocent fellow-citizens and readers, the words of Father John Bernard de Rossi, *who died 57 years ago*, as the utterance of the present Catholic Archæologist, Giovanni B. de Rossi, or his brother Michael—the "famous living Italian Roman Catholic scholar of Catacomb-inscription celebrity" as he almost hyperbolically called him, because he thought he would help him through with his little "lawn tennis set." The Vicar writes: "It was to the Seed of the Woman, God Incarnate, directly and personally, that the crushing of the Serpent's head was attributed, not to the Woman nor to Him in conjunction

with Her, but to *Him alone*, and *it is in Him and through Him that all faithful Christians are enabled to crush Satan under their feet also.*" The italics are mine. What is the story of Balaam? Verily does history repeat itself! And what does St. Paul mean when he says that "the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all impiety and injustice *of those men that detain the truth of God in injustice?*" How very like the language of the old Catholic Saints and Doctors is that of the Vicar, just quoted! For instance, the Bishop's "unreliable" St. Bernard says: "Christ crushed the serpent's head by his death, suffering Himself to be wounded in the heel. His blessed mother crushed him likewise, by her co-operation to the mystery of the Incarnation and by rejecting, with horror, the very first suggestion of the enemy, to commit even the smallest sin." St. Gregory the Great (*Mor.* i. 38) says: "*We crush the serpent's head when we extirpate from our heart the beginnings of temptation, and then he lays snares for our heel, because he opposes the end of a good action with greater craft and power.*" I cannot forbear referring here to an injunction my dear, good Irish mother used to give me, when a boy rambling in the woods, to always kill the first snake of the season that I met with, and never to allow one to cross my path—an injunction I have not yet forgotten. This is doubtless the survival of some old "Popish" superstition which would seem to have overmastered even the great St. Patrick, and from whom one of his daughters in the faith may have inherited it! Now, I suppose this writer will admit that the Mother of our Lord was a "faithful Christian." He himself calls her the "Chief of Saints." Why then is it unlawful for Catholics to say that she crushes Satan under her feet, in his own words just quoted, and those of St. Bernard and St. Gregory? The Vulgate, Douay and Wycliffe's version of the Bible do say so and Catholics say so too—and that is all they do say. Wherein does their meaning, when properly understood as I have explained it from these great Catholic saints, differ from the Protestant meaning attached, I trust, to "*It or HE shall bruise thy head?*" It differs not at all. Christ Jesus—the only name under Heaven given to men

whereby they must be saved—crushes the serpent's head by the prowess of His own Divinity, Power, and Virtue; His Blessed Mother and all other "faithful Christians" in, through, and by Him—by giving birth at once to her Son and Redeemer and in the words of the promulgating Decree—"by that virtue with which she was endued from on high." Section 15.

Why should not, then, the representation of the Blessed Mary, declared by the Angel to be "full of grace," and trampling the Serpent under foot be "very common among Roman Catholics"—"true Catholic Christians" as they are? It "has been for years, and still is very common," he says. Yes, thanks to God, and for more years than he seems to take in. It is so easy for him to circumscribe the limits of the life of his own little "cult," that the contemplation of centuries seems to make him dizzy; to give him a mental squint, so to speak, in presence of the spectacle of the historic grandeur of the Catholic Church which therefore sits upon him like a nightmare. Is this representation, then, as he says, the invention of Pius IX.? Pestilent nonsense! The man is stark mad! Christian archæology, symbolism and art, is full of the idea. The original, in another form, appeared at Bethlehem in that sublime picture of "the Child with Mary his Mother," which the Magi saw on that happy morning when "the stars sang together," and before which they knelt and adore. I am not *arguing* now, but only *instructing* the Vicar and his Episcopal superior, if, oddly enough, he acknowledges him as such, in Catholic truth. "God sent his Son, MADE OF A WOMAN," says St. Paul, *Galatians* iv. 4. Here is the *germinal*, the *basilar* principle of all devotion to our Blessed Mother as "Chief of Saints." This thought carries me out on the wide ocean of Catholic truth, while my opponents are away up in little rivulets and stranded on shoals at that, with hardly water enough to moisten the soles of their parched feet. It lifts me and my subject to the mountain top, while my opponents are browsing in the valleys below. The profound and eternal principles which underlie the dogmas we hold, the honor we pay the saints, and the worship of God in which we join, give a scope and grasp to our knowledge of the Christian religion too tre-

mendous to be cooped up in cavil such as my opponents indulge in; and one feels "cabin'd, cribb'd, confin'd" in the attempt to talk *up* the little "*Narrows*" where they do their theological thinking. An instructed Catholic is simply a giant in knowledge of the Christian religion compared with such men, and he feels uneasy in combat with dwarfs. This is no mere extravagance or affectation, but literal fact. A Catholic may be unable through want of habit or reading, through indisposition or inability to handle details, to answer readily or clearly to those thousand little petulances which a read adversary may launch by the hour; and a learned Protestant will often fancy he has "shut him up," the real fact being that the Catholic *is* "shut up" by the stupendous non-acquaintance of his opponent. He may give some general answer to such popular objections as St. Bartholomew's, or "The Gunpowder Plot"; he may speak *wisely* on Littledale's "Plain Reasons," "Bishop Strossmayer's speech at the Vatican Council," or "The Impious Utterances" of "St. Liguori" and "The Raccolta," but, because his creed is a logical synthesis, he feels all the time how superficial it all is, and that what he really has to do is to begin at the beginning, to discuss what is meant by Christianity, and what the very theory of the supernatural involves. This he cannot do in a moment.

"God sent his Son, *made of a woman*." Christianity, therefore, is *the religion of the Incarnation*. All there is in it proceeds from, depends on, and clusters around that ineffable mystery, in which the design of God in creation—the deification of the creature, or his elevation to perfect union with God—is consummated. The devotion to Mary grows out of the Incarnation, as does the Church herself, and tends, we think, to keep alive faith in that crowning act of the Creator. If we would express Christianity as a whole we must symbolize the Incarnation, and the only perfect symbol possible is that of the reality which the Magi saw—the Madonna and Child. And why is it the only symbol of the Incarnation? Because the Incarnation means that God is man; but how can we express the truth that God is man except by showing that he has a mother? In his divine nature he has no mother; then if he

has a mother he is man. Whence the Creeds do not merely say that Christ is the Son of God, or that the Son of God was made man, but affirm that He was "*born of the Virgin Mary*"; "*Incarnate of (or from) the Virgin Mary*,"—thus setting forth the same divine Person as at once the Son of God and the Son of Mary. That is, they show us Incarnate God in his Mother's arms, they *symbolize* the Incarnation by the Madonna and Child. This, I need not say, is no mere modern idea. It is found again and again in the Catacombs. See De Rossi, in the French translation of his work, "*Images de la Sainte Vierge choisies dans les Catacombes de Rome*." Rome 1863, p. 6.

And the poetic representation of the woman crushing the serpent's head is also of great antiquity. It is sung by Prudentius, the most illustrious of the Christian poets, who flourished about 405, in his work, *Cathemerinon seu Liber Hymnorum Quotidianorum*, 3, 5, 146, SS. as follows:

Hoc odium vetus illud erat,
Hoc erat aspidis atque hominis
Digladiabile discidium,
Quod modo cernua femineis
Vipera proteritur pedibus.

Edere namque deum merita
Omnia virgo venena domat,
Tractibus anguis inexplicitis
Virus inerme piger revomit
Gramine concolor in viridi.

But the crowning proof that Pius IX. did not invent the idea of the figure said by the Vicar to have been erected by him, is furnished by the celebrated statue ordered to be made by Ugo de Summo and erected in a chapel in Cremona, in 1047. He ordered to be made—I translate: "A noble and beautiful statue of incorruptible wood or marble to represent the figure of Blessed Mary our mother crowned with twelve stars, fully clothed with the sun and moon, and having beneath her feet the old serpent to which God had said in earthly Paradise: *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, etc.* (Gen.

iii. 15). I wish, too, that the serpent be so carved that he may be seen to eject his poison harmlessly, and that his most vile head the Blessed Virgin may so crush, as becomes her, who by the grace of her Son, her redemption being anticipated, was preserved from the original stain, her soul and body being intact and immaculate.

"I also ordain that every year on the festival of the Immaculate Conception of Blessed Mary, Mother of God, in this same chapel during Mass . . . this hymn be sung :

"Candidissima uti lilia
 Salve aeterni Patris filia.
 Salve mater Redemptoris
 Salve sponsa Spiratoris.

"Sine macula concepta
 Salve Triadis electa.
Salve inferni victorix aspidis
 Illius expers sola cuspidis.

"Salve Triadis electa
 Sine macula concepta."

On this famous monument of Christian antiquity, see Ballerini, *Sylloge Monumentorum*, part first, pp. 1-25. Rome, 1854.¹

¹ I have before me the *Sylloge* of the learned Jesuit critic, Father Ballerini, in which the above document is given in full and illustrated with explanatory notes. Father Hurter, in his *Dogmatic Theology*, vol. 2, p. 390, gives an extract from it and refers to the Parisian edition of Ballerini, while my edition is the Roman. Since writing the above Letter, however, I find that Father Harper, who had formerly quoted it in proof of a popular belief in, and devotion to the Immaculate Conception of Mary in the *eightth century*, now denies its authenticity, and refers, in support of his contention, to a contribution on the subject from a learned Bollandist (Jesuit) in the columns of the Society's famous publication, *Études Religieuses*, which he had not before seen. I leave the matter in the hands of experts ; but it is another striking proof of the care and fearlessness with which Catholic scholarship, purely and simply in the cause of truth, has walked over the records of ancient documents, testing and sounding at every step, in their endeavors to find every boggy spot in them. See the splendid tribute of the Anglican Professor, Canon Stokes, to the Bollandists, in Letter XI. of the *Rejoinder*.

How many hundreds more of symbolical representations of the Holy Mother could I give from Christian art through the ages? See Clement's "*Christian Symbols*," pp. 191, 214. But as Ruskin observes, "Art is nothing but a noble and expressive language," and the "Glories of Mary," whether portrayed by the rude artist of the Catacombs, a Raphael with his hundred and twenty Madonnas, or a Cimabue, a Dante or a Wordsworth, are still for the sake of her Son, are ordered to that great central fact of our holy religion—the Incarnation—and do but remind us that there was One, who, though He was all blessed from all eternity, yet for the sake of sinners "did not shrink from the Virgin's womb." I am not here discussing any doctrine concerning her, but simply meeting this writer's statement about the figure which he says Pius IX. erected, Dec. 8th, 1854. According to Clement, page 210, the model of the Virgin for the Immaculate Conception is the woman of the Apocalypse. In the *façade* of the Cathedral in this city, there is a statue representing this Immaculate Conception with the moon beneath her feet, while she crushes the serpent's head. The significance of the whole idea, whether embodied in figure or text, I have fully explained, and having vindicated the Catholic position thereon, need dwell no further on it.

LETTER VI.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—I have been asked to give a translation of the quoted Latin hymns, for the benefit of non-classical readers. The first stanza from the beautiful hymn of Prudentius is as follows: "Hence came the enmity of old between the serpents and man, that inextinguishable (implacable) feud,—*that now the viper prostrate beneath the woman's feet lies crushed and*

trampled on." Second stanza: "For the Virgin, who obtained grace to bring forth God, hath charmed away all his poisons; *and driven to hide himself in the grass, green as himself, he there coiled up in his folds, torpidly vomits forth his now harmless venom."*

The hymn ordered to be sung in the Mass by the famous Ugo de Summo, is as follows:

Spotless as the lily
Hail daughter of the Eternal Father,
Hail Mother of the Redeemer,
Hail spouse of the Holy Ghost.

Hail elect of the Trinity
Conceived without stain.
Hail vanquisher of the infernal
Serpent who alone didst avoid his dart.
Hail elect of the Trinity
Conceived without stain.

Of the Vicar's last letter there remain to be dealt with—his quotation from Canon Oakeley, his comments thereon and conclusions therefrom. I am obliged to refer to it, in the execution of my purpose, that I may burn out its crypto-poisonous deceits, lest they might mislead and my work seem incomplete. And, first, he calls Canon Oakeley "an Ultramontane of the Ultramontanes," thus using the word offensively for the whole Catholic communion—a sort of substitute for the word "*Popery*," which has grown somewhat vulgar. But as a controversial trick it is simply characteristic, and I would not notice it did not this writer whine so piteously for the "polite and polished style" of treatment for himself. Perhaps after all I rightly "measured my man." My readers may like to know a little about this "Ultramontane." Who was he? He was at one time a most charming Ritualistic minister, and as he himself would say, "*played at priest*" in that celebrated Margaret street chapel in London, where he endeavored to work out to the utmost the liturgical and devotional capabilities of the Anglican system. His object was to engraft as much

Catholic feeling upon the English Ritual as it would bear, to make his flock as Catholic as it was possible without ceasing to be Anglican. But the system broke down under the pressure—the plant would not bear the new honors set upon it. Instead of sympathy from his ecclesiastical superior, less happy in this than the man who now insults his memory, a prosecution in the Ecclesiastical Courts checked and crushed Mr. Oakeley's attempt to infuse life into the service and devotion of the English Church. The illusion was dispelled; and he saw no alternative but sinking down fairly into Anglicanism in its ordinary dreariness, or embracing the glorious liberty and consolations of Catholicity. He responded to God's grace and accepted the latter. In "A Letter on Submitting to the Catholic Church" he says: "I have now come round to the opinion with which others wiser than myself began: that the attempt to infuse the Roman spirit into the Anglican body is like 'putting new wine into old vessels,' the effect of which must be to mar the vessel and spill the wine—to dissipate the Catholic introduction and shiver the Anglican receptacle to pieces." He was ordained a priest of the Catholic Church and loved, lived and labored for her cause till his death a few years ago. Of course, therefore, he is "an Ultramontane!" But let that pass. During his life he wrote many able and beautiful things, in prose and verse, but his very best was his triumphant answer to his old friend, Dr. Pusey's *Irenicon*—a pamphlet entitled "The Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work." From this pamphlet is taken the quotation which the Vicar gives as follows: "I now come to what we (Roman Catholics) regard as the *Scriptural germ* of every doctrine and the *legitimate ground* of every authorized devotion on the subject of the Blessed Virgin. I mean the prediction of her office in the Christian Dispensation uttered by Almighty God at time of the fall," and he brackets—(viz.: Gen. iii. 15). Now in the name of the sacred memory of Canon Oakeley, of honor, decency and truth, I invoke upon this writer the reprobation of all fair-minded and truth-loving men! Has he in his possession Father Oakeley's pamphlet, or is he quoting second-hand? In either case his sin is the same; and is the Bishop a

particeps criminis? He *intends* to give the impression that Canon Oakeley is speaking of that part of the text under discussion—"SHE shall crush thy head," etc.—whereas he is speaking of Mary as the Woman divinely prophesied as Satan's direct and immediate enemy in that great scheme of Redemption which God was announcing, whose seed, Christ, was to redeem the world and between whom and the serpent undying enmity was to exist. It is "her office in the Christian dispensation," as mother of our Redeemer and Saviour, in His sacred humanity, that is predicted in the utterance of Almighty God, and this, with all that it implies, is her great glory as "chief of saints." Well, then, may Canon Oakeley call it the "Scriptural germ" and "legitimate ground" of devotion to her. Will this writer deny it? But the reading of "HE," "SHE" or "IT" does not affect this sublime truth which is absolutely indifferent to them, as I have so fully shown, and Canon Oakeley builds nothing on them. I challenge this Vicar, then, to produce his proof to the contrary, if he has it, and from the pamphlet, or stand before this community *branded* as the prince of gabblers and tergiversators!

My readers can now "measure their man" when he says, speaking of the above quotation, that it "is a very strong statement and ought to be exceeding startling to those who accept it." But *who will now accept it* in the sense he has so malignantly tried to twist out of it? And as for being startled, well, Catholics are too familiar with the blasphemies against truth of that Grand Lama of ritualism—Littledale, to be at all moved by the stammerings of a mere "middy" in his crew. He follows up his last statement by saying: "Especially when it is known that Liguori (Glories of Mary, Pt. 2, Disc. 1), Pope Pius IX. and many of the bishops who asked him to promulge the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, based their chief arguments in favor of it on the false reading in some such terms as these: 'She who was said to crush Satan could never have been, even for a moment, even in her mother's womb, under original sin.'" "In some such terms as these!" How perfect an imitation of the cuttle-fish! He thus obfuscates the waters of truth in order to escape from in-

convenient scrutiny! How can I, willing and anxious to meet every miserable semblance of argument of this writer, be expected to encounter and grapple with so shadowy and indefinite a statement? In February, 1849, Pius IX., in answer to petitions which flowed in from every side asking him to pronounce a dogmatic decision on this doctrine, issued from Gaeta his Encyclical Letter addressed to all the patriarchs, primates, archbishops and bishops of the Catholic world, requesting them to make known to him, in the most clear and explicit terms, what was the devotion of their clergy and people towards the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of Christ, and *what above all was their own opinion and desire*. From Asia and the East to North America and the Far West, from the shores of the Baltic to Australia and the Isles of the Great Pacific, replies poured into Rome from *six hundred and three bishops*, every one of whom, without exception, expressed his belief in the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Mother and his devotion towards this mystery of God's love and power. Before such a majestic scene what is the whole Anglican Episcopate capped by its "Papal" Privy Council with its American daughter thrown in! A sorry group indeed! By order of the great Pontiff these replies were printed *in nine large volumes with an appendix*. And yet this Vicar who never saw their very covers dares to epitomize their contents—"In some such terms as these!" What blind infatuation! What unparalleled, what audacious and arrogant insolence! It is simply and absolutely false, that many of the bishops "based their chief arguments" on the alleged "false reading" and the phrasing he has confessedly manufactured; it is shamelessly and monstrously false that *even one* of the bishops based any argument for the Prerogatives of Mary upon that part of the text: "*SHE shall crush thy head*." When it is used at all the meaning is simply that which I have already so often put, and it would be the same to the Catholic mind if "*HE*" or "*IT*" were used. And this is the sense of St. Liguori himself in the passage referred to—"Glories of Mary," p. 340. Dr. Pusey's "apt phrase" that "the major premiss of the argument is gone, when it appears that nothing is said here (Gen. iii. 15) of any personal victory of hers"

(Mary's), is therefore meaningless; it is, in the words of Canon Oakeley — "a phantom of the Devil's creating, and one among the many evidences which history and experience furnish of his implacable hostility to her whom he knows to be a great antagonist of his power." The Vicar is quite welcome to his "apt phrase," and if the cap Canon Oakeley made for Dr. Pusey fits *him* he can appropriate it with my best wishes. It is not Canon Oakeley who says there shall be enmity between the serpent and his seed and the woman—these are the words of Almighty God Himself. Amen!

Having thus disposed of the Vicar's incrustations of the main question I have now to accept the challenge—to take up the gauntlet which he throws down in the concluding paragraph of his first letter in these words: "It ought to be remembered, in this connection, that the Church of England has preserved her balance well under the circumstances, and observes four Feasts yearly in honor of the Holy Mother." What *can* he mean by "under the circumstances"?

"The Church of England!" Here a difficulty presented itself which for a moment I could not solve. I could not forget that within that church "as by law established," there are at least two parties too widely different to make it possible to argue with both at once without a great deal of force on one or the other being wasted. A sharp line, which grows sharper year by year, has to be drawn between the old-fashioned Protestant, represented by the Bishop, whose earnest conviction generally calls forth respect, and the modern Ritualist or Anglo-Catholic, as he would style himself, with whose seeming self-delusion it is so difficult to be gentle. It is of little use to prove to the Bishop that the pre-Augustine Church in England was Papal, for he might easily grant and lament it in the same breath without the fact upsetting his particular theory; and it is equally waste of time to prove to the Ritualist that the Reformation was a terrible disaster, both from the social and religious point of view. This he already believes, for, do not two Ritualistic leaders say so? The Rev. Baring Gould says the Reformation was "a miserable apostasy," and the Grand Lama Littledale says the Reformers were "*utterly unredeemed vil-*

lains"; the Ritualistic *Church News*, that "Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer and Jewell" and the rest "were apostates, traitors, perjurers, robbers and persecutors," and the *Union Review* that "Barlow and Scory were rascals"—and is not the Ritualist striving in his own way to undo the work of all these "villains"? *How* was I to reconcile these contradictions so as to be able to meet the paragraph before me? In my perplexity I had recourse to the "myriad-minded" poet. The attitude of these rival parties resembles that of the two Dromios in the comedy: each maintains that *he* is the true and original representative of the genuine Church of England, and that the other is only an impostor. Dromio of Syracuse, who represents the Bishop, says to the Duke of Ephesus, who represents the Privy Council:

"I, sir, am Dromio; command him away." But Dromio of Ephesus, who represents the Ritualist, replies:

"I, sir, am Dromio; pray let me stay." The Duke—that is the Privy Council—benignly observes that it is quite open to anybody to "stay" if only he is willing to do so; whereupon the battle ends, just as in the comedy, and one of the Dromios, giving his arm to the other, cheerfully exclaims:

"We came into the world like brother and brother; and now let's go hand in hand, not one before the other." And so I will consider the Bishop and his Vicar thus shaking hands over "The Book of Common Prayer," in which I can then look for evidence, binding on both parties, of the way in which the Church of England "preserves her balance" in honoring the Mother of man's Redeemer.

Let me begin by saying that in this paragraph the Vicar has "sounded the very base string" of religious hypocrisy and deceit, from which he can be absolved only on the assumption that he is suffering from such a paralysis of conscience as to be unable to distinguish light from darkness. Now, in reply to his claim I charge that, judged by the Book of Common Prayer, no sectaries have surpassed, few have equalled, the Anglican Church in ingratitude and irreverence towards her in whom the Most High became Incarnate. Thus Greeks and Russians, in spite of their exile from Catholic Unity, have not so far departed

from Christian belief in this particular. There is not a house in all Russia, from the palace of the Emperor to the hut of the peasant, which does not contain a picture of the Immaculate Virgin. Even modern Greeks, fallen as they are, cease not to invoke her. England alone knows not, nor desires to know, the Mother of the world's Redeemer. The only Englishmen who comprehend, however faintly, what she has been to the human family, are the professors of pure rationalism. Though they have misused, they have not quite abdicated, the gift of reason; and it helps them to see in part what is hidden from those who, in losing faith, seem to have lost reason also. "The world," says Lecky, in one of the most remarkable works of our time, and one of the saddest, "is governed by its ideals, and seldom or never has there been one which has exercised a more profound and, on the whole, a more salutary influence than the mediæval conception of the Virgin. For the first time woman was elevated to her rightful position, and the sanctity of weakness was recognized as well as the sanctity of sorrow. No longer the slave or toy of man, no longer associated only with ideas of degradation, and of sensuality, woman rose, in the person of the Virgin Mother, into a new sphere, and became the object of a reverential homage of which antiquity had had no conception. Love was idealized. The moral charm and beauty of female excellence was for the first time felt. A new type of character was called into being; a new kind of admiration was fostered. Into a harsh and ignorant and benighted age this ideal type infused a type of gentleness and purity unknown to the proudest civilizations of the past. In the pages of living tenderness which many a monkish writer has left in honor of his celestial patron; in the millions who, in many lands and in many ages, have sought with no barren desire to mould their character into her image; in those holy maidens, who, for the love of Mary, have separated themselves from all the glories and pleasures of the world, to seek in fastings and vigils and humble charity to render themselves worthy of her benediction; in the new sense of honor, in the chivalrous respect, in the softening of manners, in the refinement of tastes displayed in all the walks of society; in these

and in many other ways we detect its influence. All that was best in Europe clustered around it, and it is the origin of many of the purest elements of our civilization." "History of Rationalism," vol. 1, pp. 234, 235.

The Church of England "observes four feasts in honor of the Holy Virgin," says this writer. Yes, and just about as McMillan's Almanac observes those three in its pages! Good God! What a way to honor her in whose pure veins first flowed that precious and life-giving blood whose shedding on the Cross cancelled death, satisfied the justice of God and saved us! Let me prove what I have said. In the English church calendar it is true there are certain days which are called feasts of the Blessed Virgin—the Purification, Annunciation, Visitation and Nativity—but can anything be conceived more sad and melancholy, more cold and uninviting than these Anglican remembrances of Mary? They are *fasts* rather than *feasts*. They are the gaunt and awful spectres of those Catholic festivals which used once to cheer up and gladden the popular heart of the nation. They are indeed called festivals of Mary, but Mary's name remains unnoticed and uncommemorated by them. Listen, my readers. The few other saints whom Anglicanism professes to honor have their names mentioned in the Collect of the day, but even this cold tribute of respect is denied to the Mother of God! The rule is, on such days, to avoid as much as possible any allusion to the Holy Virgin, and the occasion is improved into an attack on the Catholic Church for her "Idolatrous worship, etc., etc." The Vicar calls her the "Chief of Saints." Yet, take it in Christian hearts, if you can, her blessed name is never mentioned from one end of the Book to the other, beyond the way in which it occurs in McMillan's Almanac, outside of its mention in the Gospels, where it could not be suppressed—that is, not the slightest notice is taken of her on account of any merit of hers! I wish I had space to copy here the Collects for the feasts of the Purification and the Annunciation, the only feasts of Blessed Mary provided with Collects, and to place them side by side with the Collects for the feasts of "St. John the Baptist" and "St. Michael and All Angels." In the latter the Saints are extolled

and their examples held up for imitation, whereas in the former not the slightest reference is made to Mary, who is supposed to be honored by the feast. Let my readers just compare these Collects and see for themselves the way in which the so-called feasts of the "Chief of Saints" are observed. I am right, alas! too correct in saying that the Church of England indignantly rejects and scorns any teaching that calls upon it to exhibit the slightest practical reverence or gratitude to the Mother of God. If this Vicar is any better we know where he gets it—that is *sub rosa* for the present.

But what has become, in this Vicar's hands, of the *fifth* feast, marked in the church calendar—the feast of the "Conception of the Virgin" on the 8th December? This was established in England by St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Eleventh Century. Why did the Vicar suppress it in his enumeration? Was it because it is of as little importance as the four he mentioned? Give the public the reason.

Thus I leave the matter to the judgment of my readers. I have not touched "St. Liguori" and "The Raccolta." My challenge to the Bishop and his Vicar to discuss that whole subject before a select audience, chosen by ourselves through a responsible joint committee, still stands.

To put the whole matter of this controversy in a nutshell. Bishop Kingdon said that "IPSA" in the Vulgate Bible (Gen. iii. 15) was a misprint for "IPSE," and that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was based or founded on it and resulted from it. This statement I denied, both as to the misprint and its alleged connection with the doctrine; and I proved, I think, that there are *three* accepted readings in this place—IPSE, IPSA and IPSUM—so that no such question of misprint as the Bishop put it can arise. I showed, moreover, that the meaning was the same, no matter which was adopted, and that Catholic authorities used them indifferently. The consequence is that, even assuming that the true state of the question is as the Bishop put it, simply between IPSE and IPSA, yet then he was absolutely in error, as I have fully proved, in asserting that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception or its promulgation, had anything whatever to

do with it, or was in any way dependent upon it. His duty would now seem clear and imperative.

A word of explanation. I characterized the Vicar's attack on the Catholic church and myself personally as "the scream of a drunken Beelzebub." This has been objected to. I can't help it. It has, perhaps, been misunderstood. The expression is purely metaphorical, and its genesis was this: "*All the gods of the heathen are devils*," Holy Scripture says; but idols are the gods of the heathen—therefore, a worshipper of idols is an idolater, and an idolater is a worshipper of the devil. He accused the Catholic church of idolatry in all the moods and tenses, and charged against me that I *accepted* and practised her teachings thereon—and this of his own mere motion. I was not very particular about my reply, for it flashed through my mind as the counterpart of his charge against me—If I am a worshipper of devils, as you say, then you are the prince of devils, and that personage somewhat under the influence of "the ardent." That is all, and I sing no palinode over it either. He first offended, and he sticks to it. I am content.

Here I take leave of this ecclesiastical dilettant. For the present I will say with the poet ("Twelfth Night"): "Fie, thou dishonest Sathan: I call thee by the most modest terms, for I am one of those gentle ones that will use the devil himself with courtesy." But if this mild admonition does not produce the desired effect, let this reviler of the Catholic church be warned that I have a rod in pickle for him, which I shall know how to lay on—and with sufficient vigor.

I thank you, Mr. Editor, for your unbounded courtesy, and remain,

Most gratefully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

My opponent replied to the above *Résumé* in a series of seven letters. A most minute refutation of his *Strictures* is given in the following *Rejoinder*. From it, too, readers will get a more complete, and a clearer idea of his criticism than if they had the *olla podrida*, the ritualistic stew, in a mass.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—When St. Jude described certain teachers as “raging waves of the sea foaming out their own confusion,” he must have had in prophetic view the “Priest (save the mark!) of the Mission Church,” and in some such exhibition as that concluded in your columns yesterday. Like some of his modest theological progenitors—Ridley, Latimer, Barlow, Parker, Cranmer and Co., whom his favorite saint, Littledale, fondly calls “utterly unredeemed villains”—he would cheerfully offer instructions to the very Omniscient. He has poured himself out after the error of Balaam *for a reward* (St. Jude i. 11), and I hope he may get it. Will he have admirers? “Heroic Swan!”—I hear them exclaim—“I love thee even when thou gabblest like a goose.” Their bewitchment must often be expressed in Titania’s words to Bottom, the weaver, as soon as he ceased from braying:

“I pray thee, gentle mortal, sing again;
Mine ear is much enamored of thy note.”

The apostle of ritualism in this city has spoken. He has served up for its citizens a meal as foul with falsehood and calumny as was ever offered in support of a starved-out creed. I ought not to dirty my ink by noticing it. A great apostle of another gospel expresses my feelings, and while expressing, saves them from excess. “What participation has justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial?” It is indeed “beneath the dignity of a gentleman to cross swords with such an adversary,” and “were it not for deeper interests at stake than my own honor, nothing further would be heard from me.”

But I am a Priest! And lest my ministrations in that capacity be thought unauthorized, or the validity of my orders be called in question—shades of Parker and Barlow, avault!—I beg to refer your readers to my documents: 1 Pet. ii. 5–15; Apoc. i. 6, v. 10, xx. 6. Can Bishop Kingdon's Vicar show a better title? Well, hardly.

These texts authorize, yea, oblige me to officiate at the altar of truth, and my “priestly vows”—my baptismal promises—“bind me to be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word,” and to “silence the ignorance of foolish men.” 1 Pet. ii. 15. “Busy priest” though I am (and Lent is now upon me), other “clerical duties” must bend somewhat to the present demand, but I will not trespass upon you till next week.

I am aware of the press on your columns and will act on the spirit of your editorial intimation as strictly and sharply as an exhausting logic and the absolute requirements of the issue will permit.

Respectfully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY,

Ritchie's Building, Friday A.M., Feb. 24, 1888.

LETTER I.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINER.

ST. JOHN, N.B., Thursday evening, March 1, 1888.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—After the argument made in this matter in my *Résumé*, two courses, I submit, were open to Bishop Kingdon. He might acknowledge he had blundered, or by his silence he might show his intention of at any rate leaving those who heard or read his statements in the error into which—whether by culpable negligence and ignorance or downright malice—

he had done his best to lead them. He has elected the latter course, and has thereby exhibited himself in a light hardly consistent with his position as a "teacher in Israel." But though the Bishop is silent his Vicar comes to the rescue. Such a procedure recalls to one's mind the words of the memorable Pym: "I dare not fight," says the Bishop, "but I can wink and hold out my *iron*"—this Vicar. "It is a simple one, but what though? It will toast cheese, and it will endure cold as another man's sword will; *and there's the humor of it.*" The "strictures" would appear to have operated variously to judge from the skits in your columns of the last few days. They affected the brain as well of those who claimed to understand them as of those who proclaimed they did not. The Vicar himself confesses he takes such things *by the yard*—owing perhaps to the millinery tendencies of his theology. I am not sufficiently skilled in pathology to reconcile such conflicting results. Their professed object, however, is to vindicate the damaged reputation of the Bishop as a scholar, theologian and doctrinal historian; but unfortunately for him, their blatant and boisterous dishonesty is so damning, that they but encumber him, while they convict the writer of a readiness and ability to glut his dupes with misstatements, falsehoods and calumnies reeking with infamy. In his effort to "serve God by well-meant lies" — pious frauds, let me call them, since he likes a euphemism—he has but slipped off the motley mask from hoof and tail, and it will appear by the time I get through with him that the Bishop's worst enemy is one who *just now* professes to be of his own household.

The word of God aptly describes such as he: "Their throat is an open sepulchre, with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips, their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness." A seventh thing the Lord detesteth—"A deceitful witness that uttereth lies"; "the detractor is the abomination of men"—"a false witness shall not be unpunished, *and he that speaketh lies shall not escape.*" The Vicar has placed the judgment in my hands, but I will not execute it. I shall but point out how malevolent, belligerent, busy and zealous he has been in committing these execrable

sins of calumny and detraction, and I will then hand him over to the vengeance of your readers. At this moment he is, perhaps, chuckling over this reflection: "The scourges which afflict mankind shall not come near me; for I have made lies my refuge and under falsehood have I hid myself." He is doubtless, too, oblivious of the reply: "Forasmuch as you have put your trust in calumny . . . this iniquity and your ruin shall be like that of a high wall, whose breaking cometh suddenly at an instant. It shall be broken as the breaking of a potter's vessel that is shivered in pieces, and there shall not be found in the bursting of it a shard to take fire from the hearth or to draw a little water out of the pit."

In the olden time they studied Aristotle at Oxford, but what cares he for logic? The stomach of a Protestant ritualist could not brook such a stranger. How establish a fellowship between it and ritualism—"a white-washed abortion," a "bastard Popery," with its "stinking, greasy, anti-Christian and execrable Orders," as they are called by that great Anglican champion, Fulke. These are not my words, but those of genuinely logical Protestants who scorn to "steal the livery of heaven to serve the devil in"—to masquerade in clothes stolen from the Catholic Church, to deck themselves out with shreds and tatters of Catholic doctrine in the vain hope to pass themselves off and impose themselves on the world as "true Catholics." How could logic comport itself with such a sham and imposture? The Vicar professes a love for "honest speech." So do I, and I will share it with him.

Is it to be wondered at, then, that my opponent has not met my argument *in one single particular*? A more ignominious failure, a more miserable collapse of an attempted defence of one Oxford man by another is not on record. He simply abandoned it and betook himself, as he says, "to supply the public with a little thesaurus or treasury of argument against the vain boasting of Romanist controversialists." After six weeks' labor with "copious and exhaustive indices" we get from this "busy priest" what? Simply a tailless little mouse so far as the question under discussion goes. He filled your columns with quotations from a cloud of Catholic priests,

bishops and Popes. Very edifying reading, of course, but as germane to our subject as an argument on the parallax of the moon. He might have relieved the monotony, and brightened the picture somewhat by introducing a few ritualistic "Fathers," but perhaps such a suggestion would be premature and might be taken as a joke. *Absit!*

In addition to the counts in my indictment already laid against my opponent and proved in my *Résumé*, I now add another to the effect that no writer within my knowledge has ever been guilty of more conscious and deliberate, unparalleled and unblushing suppression of the truth, as I will clearly show in my critique on the "Strictures." Your readers will be the jury to whom I confidently submit the issue. I have no intention of wandering off or allowing him to draw me away into the mazes of his rhapsody, but I will cover the ground pretty effectually, without, I trust, an undue demand upon your space, and without violence to the logical instincts of interested readers.

LETTER II.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I will take up the Vicar's letters, seven in all, *seriatim*, and I will paragraph them.¹ I will also adopt his manner of referring to mine. This will conduce to clearness and enable your readers to track him with me through his long labyrinth of falsehood and sophistry, inconsistency and misrepresentation. The blood-stains by the way will witness for themselves.

There is little in his first letter to the point beyond appeals *ad misericordiam*. "Cry-baby" is its key-note. He protests against the use of the "shillalah." It is always associated, you know, with the "poor Irish," as he calls them. He prefers a

¹ It became impossible to carry this out.

club and uses it right vigorously. I do not object. My own light weapon has a history. I do not wonder that an Englishman objects to its lightning flashing around his head. Before the foot of the Saxon had cursed the soil of Ireland her lovely virgin daughters could walk abroad unprotected, though adorned with gems and gold, and they knew it :

Sir Knight ! I feel not the least alarm,
 No son of Erin will offer me harm—
 For though they love women and golden store,
 Sir Knight ! they love honor and virtue more.

No parent, brother or husband need worry, and Ireland had no fiendish *Pall Mall Gazette* disclosures. With the advent to her shores of the bestial English landlord the “shillalah” was in some sort consecrated to woman’s service, when

On the one side stood virtue and Erin,
 On the other the Saxon and guilt.

Ireland’s sons stood by Ireland’s daughters and the result was an oft-told tale. Indeed “it’s a way they have in Ould Ireland.” I thank the Vicar for his magnanimous avowal of the service it has rendered in her cause whose honor is so dear to every truly Christian heart and to every Catholic maiden, wife and mother. I will take it with me as I follow him, and though he is, by all the rules of decent, manly debate, a controversial outlaw, I will use it sparingly—to a degree.

Parag. 3.—Here he tries to set up a breastwork and writes five sections. ’Twere better for him had he taken his chances without it. I appeal to your readers that from first to last I did not, and did not undertake to, discuss on *principle* the *why* and the *wherefore* of Catholic devotion to the Immaculate Mother of God ever blessed. The logical conditions of the controversy, it seemed to me, did not permit it. That, however, I offered to do on the public platform, but my opponents, *discreetly* as it now appears, refused to meet me. I referred, by way of explanation, not of defence, to the Incarnation as the formal, efficient and final cause of that devotion. I intended

thereby to furnish Protestants generally with a *pou sto* (a whereon to stand) from which they might be able to catch a glimpse of the heights of the Catholic philosophy of this matter. For however our love and devotion may delight to paint the glories of the mother we never allow them to approach near the incommunicable glory of the Son. But we delight to meditate on the nearness of the glorified flesh of Jesus to that Mary, Its original source. A man must be a Pagan who is not moved by such a mystery.

The Catholic intellect and heart, nevertheless, for its last resting-place, even here, ever goes back to that Adorable Heart whence all graces come; which made Mary what she is, "the Chief of Saints"—the great masterpiece of that only Redemption, which is in Christ our Lord. These were my thoughts when referring to the Incarnation in my "Résumé." My opponent here complains that I gave him and the Bishop "elementary instruction on the doctrine of the Incarnation, as if we did not realize (probably far better than himself) that this is the foundation mystery of our faith." Well, as to the Bishop's knowledge I have no data by which to pronounce, unless, following his Vicar's style of reasoning, I should conclude, from two blunders and seriously damaging misstatements, to his general unreliability.

The Vicar himself, however, has been more *communicative*. He loves "to contribute some solid information" on every question, at all times, and to everybody. It is a way every ritualistic pseudo-"priest" has. He is ready to instruct the Pope, the Catholic church ancient and modern, and his own Anglican Protestant Bishop, though should the latter fail to agree with him, he snaps his finger in his face and—*goes to gaol!* "Hast thou seen a man wise in his own conceit? There shall be more hope of a fool than of him." Proverbs xxvi. 12. The Vicar has put himself on record. "*Words are things,*" he has told us. I accept his principle, and from it will prove that he *still* needs "elementary instruction" on the Incarnation. I quote from the synopsis of his sermon as follows: "The Holy Virgin Mother of God" is "dear, as the hallowed vessel from whose substance God the Holy Ghost took the

sacred humanity of our Lord Jesus." He is not copying now from "St. Liguori," "The Raccolta," Pusey, Littledale or "Janus"; he is giving us a little theology on his own account. And what puzzle-headedness and bewilderment! What can this Oxford theologian of immense pretence and equal incapacity mean? I thought it was *God the Son* who became Incarnate by the Holy Ghost—"took earth from the earth . . . received flesh from the flesh of Mary" (St. Aug.), assumed and raised human nature and united it to his Divine Person by hypostatic union—"by taking of the manhood into God," as the Athanasian Creed has it. I never heard before that God the Father or God the Holy Ghost "*took*" flesh and *assumed* either Mary's humanity or Christ's sacred humanity. "Words are things" the Vicar should remember from the Arian Controversy. But perhaps he is beyond me here, as he has been reading the Roman Catholic Fathers for "*six weeks*" with "copious and exhaustive indices"—that is, he has read them Hebraically, beginning where others usually end. "Six weeks'" instruction, however, would not qualify a Catholic child for the sacrament of Confirmation and I ought not to be too exacting, seeing that the Anglican church and her theology is "gangrened" with heresy on that "foundation mystery of our faith"—the Incarnation.

Let me prove this serious proposition. I quote from the *Union Review*, an Anglican publication of the very highest authority among Ritualists themselves:

"A great deal of the shrinking felt by Anglicans from giving our Lady due honor, arises from the lingering effects of heretical teaching, or unconsciously heretical belief, on the mystery of the Incarnation. *Nestorianism prevails to a very great extent among English churchmen, and its withering effects are very difficult to shake off*, even by those who have long become orthodox in their theoretical creed. . . . It is also true, and deserves consideration, that *there has been hitherto no marked tendency to heresy on the subject of the Incarnation among Roman Catholics, while, where the dignity of the Blessed Virgin has been underrated, heresies have speedily crept in*. . . . It is sadly true that many persons

in the English church place our Blessed Lord *exactly where the Catholic church places a saint*. They see nothing wrong in asking Him to pray for them, and do (in words which Canon Oakeley hesitates in applying to English churchmen, *but which he might have truly used*) seem to imagine that we suppose our Lord to mediate or intercede with the Eternal Father in the same sense in which we believe the Blessed Virgin to mediate or intercede with Him. *They speak to our Blessed Lord as if he was a human being with a human personality*, and in consequence their attitude of mind towards Him and towards His Blessed Mother would be *so precisely the same* that no wonder they shrink from the comparison." (pp. 400-401). So much for an Anglican on Anglicanism. It is a confession on the doctrinal corruption prevalent within his communion more honorable to the writer's clear-headedness and straight-forwardness than a Ritualist is in the habit of making.

I now introduce a witness of a different kind, but of world-wide authority—Cardinal Newman. Even the Vicar condescends to patronize him. "Few Protestants," says the cardinal, "*have any real perception of the doctrine of God and man in one person*." They speak in a dreamy, shadowy way of Christ's divinity; but when their meaning is sifted, you will find them very slow to commit themselves to any statement sufficient to show that it is Catholic. . . . Then, when they comment on the Gospels, they will speak of Christ, not simply and consistently as God, but as a being made up of God and man, partly one and partly the other, or between both, or as a man inhabited by a special divine presence. Sometimes they even go on to deny that He was the Son of God in Heaven, saying that He became the Son when He was conceived of the Holy Ghost; and they are shocked, and think it a mark both of reverence and good sense to be shocked, when the Man is spoken of simply and plainly as God. They cannot bear to have it said, except as a figure or mode of speaking, *that God had a human body, or that God suffered*. . . . Such, I believe, is the character of the Protestant notions among us on the divinity of Christ, whether among *members*

of the Anglican communion, or dissenters from it, excepting a section of the former." In view of these authorities and the Vicar's exhibition of his own theology, I would like an opportunity to examine him publicly on the *how* of the union of God the Word with humanity. The *Union Review* and Cardinal Newman might get strong support. Bah! The insolent and shameless effrontery of such a nondescript theological nonentity as this Vicar presuming to sit in judgment on the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church in regard to the gracious and Immaculate Mother of Jesus Christ, is simply disgusting! In the sight of God much may be forgiven him, but it will not be for any lessons of genuine love of the "Woman, above all women glorified," which he learned from Anglicanism; but in the sight of man he ought to show more gratitude to a Church on the scraps and crumbs of whose table the religious school to which he belongs depends for any reason it has for being at all.

To clear himself from my "unscrupulous" charges he gives a long quotation from his sermon. This offers me a good deal of satisfaction. He preached it, I believe, as the newspapers announced, *after* I had nearly finished my "Résumé." Though this looks very much like an attempt to create evidence for his case *I* do not object. To force from an enemy so much truth as it contains is no small cause for joy. Such words of respect for the Mother of God were never before heard in a Protestant church in this city; but they have no sanction in the church from which he holds the license whereby he utters them. What a cruel irony! And yet in the most unfilial fashion he gives that church a sharp blow in the face. In his very first letter in this matter he said that "the Church of England preserved her balance well under the circumstances, and observed four feasts" of the Blessed Virgin. I pointed out her mode of observance, and asked him to tell the public why he suppressed the *fifth* feast in his church calendar—that of the "conception of Mary." He gave us no *stricture* in reply. The truth is I riddled his statement so badly that he swallowed it, and in shame and humiliation straightaway confesses judgment by saying that it is "the sad

and sorrowful lot of the English church . . . to have to wear the appearance of those who fail to yield the Blessed Virgin her proper honor. Her preachers are unable, *through no fault of their own*, to eulogize the Blessed Mother of God as it is meet they should, without being compelled to hedge their expressions with so many *cautions about false doctrine and practice* in regard to her, that many a one shrinks, &c." Surely here are concessions enough to utterly destroy and annihilate any logical defence of Anglicanism, and yet the same preacher makes accusations against the Catholic Church, which render his concessions simply monstrous. But the consoling logic is charming! Some persons sin by excess: therefore I am justified in sinning by defect! This is the miserable subterfuge, this the doctrine put forth in the name of a Church, which clamors for recognition as a "branch" (save the mark!) of the Church of God—"the pillar and the ground of truth." *Absit blasphemia!* Of course the Vicar means to say, "Look at me, however! I am a Catholic," but no "Romanist." "No pent-up Utica contracts my powers"—of self-exaltation. Church of England: Church of "my priestly vows"—scat! What care I for your "cautions about false doctrine." For "six weeks" I have been scavenging the works of the "Early Church Fathers concerning the Blessed Virgin," and I must admit, I stand "aghast" at the sublime titles given to "the holy Theotokos." I find "that very excellent things have been spoken of her by divines of all ages," but their panegyrics in her praise have so confused, perverted and knocked out of joint "the faith *once for all* delivered to the saints" that I felt it to be my duty and by virtue of my "priestly vow" to restore the balance. This I have done to my own entire satisfaction, in my beautiful and eloquent sermon, and as a "Pope" in my own right. I may now well believe, indeed I know, *that out of pure gratitude* she will feel obliged "to love, honor and pray specially for"—*me*. And I protest that the fact that one of those "poor Irish" was after me with the "shillalah" had no part in my inspiration." Ha! Ha!! Ha!!!

Now when did the "English Church" become so "cautious about false doctrine?" Is it *since* she had as bishops Hoadly,

Whately, and Hampden (one Cambridge and two Oxford men), the first of whom was an Arian, the second a Sabellian, while the notorious Hampden (who died in 1868) was a sort of conglomerated compound of both, or something more infamous. The Tractarian party brought a charge of Arianism against him in 1833; a University Statute of censure for heterodoxy in his Bampton lectures stood against him in 1836, but it made no difference; he was made Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford! His luck was in. That orthodox saint (!) Lord John Russell, in 1847 nominated him to the See of Hereford. A violent opposition was made. Many of the Bishops (to their honor) remonstrated publicly. The Queen, however, as spiritual head of the church, gives Anglican Bishops their jurisdiction, and Lord John's pet was "consecrated"—to what?

Is it *since* she sent Bishop Colenso a missionary to the African heathen, to become, as he did, in spite of all attempts to discipline him, an apostle of infidelity to the country that sent him? Is it *since* the publication by Anglican Ministers of that blasphemous book "*Essays and Reviews*"? The writers were prosecuted, but the Privy Council, the ultimate court of appeal in Anglican theology, and in which Bradlaugh, Chamberlain, Morley or Labouchere may sit to-morrow, sustained them. They retained their benefices, endowments, social position and hopes of preferment in the very church whose vital doctrines they scorned and scoffed at. Hear Dr. Pusey on the matter: "The *Essays and Reviews* let loose a tide of scepticism upon the young and uninstructed. . . . Their writers threw doubts on everything. They took for granted that the ancient faith had been overthrown, and the *Essays* were mostly a long trumpet-note of victories won (they assumed) without any cost to *them* over the faith, in Germany." *Lectures on Daniel*, p. 1. Is it *since* Mr. Gorham, an *Anglican Minister*, denied Baptismal Regeneration and was sustained in his denial by the Privy Council, which overruled Gorham's Bishop and Archbishop? This doctrine is now an open question in a Church claiming to be Christian and Catholic! Thirteen distinguished men, including Pusey and

Manning, signed a public protest. It was of no avail, and six of them became Catholics. Pusey never could digest the heresy, and died with it still on his stomach.

It is now sufficiently clear that no form of opinion comes amiss in the Anglican Church. It is simply the lurking-place of the most omnigenous latitudinarianism. Unitarians, Sabelians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Utilitarians, Methodists, Calvinists, Swedenborgians, Irvingites, Free-thinkers—all these it can tolerate in its very bosom; from Hampden, Colenso and the writers of the *Essays and Reviews* down to the meretricious ritualistic pseudo-“priest” who swaggers about with the “Roman collar” round his neck, that historic badge of the Roman Catholic Priesthood—all these are accommodated, but Rome it cannot abide. These are facts long patent to the world and cannot be disproved. I know its history well. The Anglican Church has become one great theological grave-yard. Over its corpse hovers the vulture of Ritualism in stolen Roman Catholic plumes, and while it strives “to create a soul under the ribs of death,” it screams out its eternal requiem.

I regret that the twaddle indulged in by my opponent in his first letter has obliged me to be, perhaps, prolix in clearing decks. But, as I have been thus enabled to scatter to the wind and to dispose of a kind of rubbish spread all over his “Strictures,” I may be pardoned. I will make the engagement as short as possible. In my next I will plunge *in medias res*.

LETTER III.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—In opening his second letter the Vicar declares his intention to examine whether I have properly performed the *penance* he had set me for my “impertinence” in impugning Bishop Kingdon’s scholarship and honesty. I am beginning to fear that with all the assistance he gets from our books, his

progress in the study of moral theology is slow. He evidently does not yet know that the sacrament of the church which he parodies consists of three parts—*Contrition*, *Confession* and *Satisfaction*. This a “priest” ought to know, no matter how “busy” he may be. However, I am not just now a fit subject for his ministrations, kindly meant though they be. I have no *contrition*, I make no *confession*, and as for *satisfaction*, well, he has about as much authority to impose a penance as a Salvation Army lassie. But let that pass. Such newly found zeal and regard for the Episcopal office in a ritualistic “father” (ye gods!) is very amusing. The late Anglican Bishop Fraser of Manchester said “there are no words strong enough to express the contempt and righteous indignation that should be felt at the folly of ‘ritualistic sacerdotal pretensions.’” He, of course, was no favorite with pseudo-“priests,” and phantasmal and fantastic imitators of Catholic rites and ceremonies. The reason is well known and one of the causes famous. Lord Penzance, at the instigation of the Bishop, sent a “sacerdotal pretender,” Rev. Mr. Green, to gaol, so that from being a *pirate* of Catholic doctrines and practices he became to his fellow ritualists a *martyr* of Penzance. But the Rev. Harry Cowgill, Mr. Green’s curate, during his long imprisonment, carried on boldly, and despite the Bishop, at all events for a while, all the inhibited ceremonies—altar lights, the mixed chalice and Eucharistic Vestments. “Priestly vows” and the oath of Canonical obedience sat as lightly on the Rev. Harry as they do on every ritualistic “Pope” when anyone in authority calls into question his pontifical prerogatives, or the infallibility of his views either on ecclesiastical law or the doctrine of the primitive church. Bishop Fraser described Ritualism as possessed of “the anarchical temper which will recognize no law but its own will, which would wreck a great church for the sake of preserving an Ornaments’ Rubric”; but he hated it, not wisely but too well, and he died of a broken heart about two years ago. Again: the present Anglican Bishop Ryle of Liverpool recently preached on Baptism and the Holy Eucharist—sacraments which hold in the Christian faith a place which is undeniably essential, fundamental and elementary. He said

that they are "of little, or, at all events, of secondary importance," he declared roundly that "the Church of England has no altar, no sacrifice, no sacerdotal priests," and that the Ritualists had reduced the church to a state of "lawless anarchy." The Ritualistic *Church News* (from which I quote) "baited" the unfortunate Bishop in the most merciless fashion. It called him the "Dunce of the Episcopate," described his teaching as "silly," "exploded over and over again," "nonsense," "railing," "shocking," and told him that the minimum to be expected of him was "to hold his tongue" so that he might not "utter the pernicious nonsense he generally talks when he speaks at all." Again, at a church congress, Bishop Ryle said: "So long as the Church of England is infected with semi-Romanism on the extreme right and semi-unbelief on the extreme left, and cannot cure or expel the disease, so long, we may depend on it, our Nonconformist brethren will never embark in our ship." The Bishop here pays a well-deserved compliment to the intelligence of his dissenting Protestant brethren who are not ashamed of their name. He, too, was obliged to "gaol" some of his "sacerdotal pretenders." Your readers will remember that at the time of the celebration of the Queen's jubilee in this city the Rev. Bell Cox was languishing in a Liverpool prison for aping the Catholic Church, "playing priest" and practising a "bastard Popery." The Vicar publicly declared this a sufficient reason why the jubilee should be observed by a fast—he thought it such an outrage that a *confre* should be hindered in his career of "lawless anarchy" by his own Bishop and he an Episcopal "Dunce." His pretended defence of Bishop Kingdon exhibits humor hardly inferior in kind, and supplies some excellent touches of light comedy. The notion that he is anxious about his office, scholarship or honesty, is a "goak" of that peculiar flavor which would have delighted the lamented Artemus. The Bishop must feel like saying to him:

Perhaps it was well to dissemble your love,
But why did you kick me down stairs?

He launches into his work with a sprightly escapade of ten

paragraphs which he calls an "Outline history of the Vulgate." It is empty, futile and trumpery, and of no importance as respect the points at issue; it is simply a jet from *one* of the *spiracles* of the cuttle-fish settling himself into position for work. I will say but a word on it. He gives it, he says, that your readers may perceive the shallowness and worthlessness of my remarks about St. Augustine and Jerome, and the hollowness of the pæan I sang over Clement's edition of the Latin Bible. I submit that he has not invalidated one single statement made by me in this connection: and I sang no pæan. It is not in my line. The singing was done by a chorus of the ablest Protestant critics who have written in praise of the Vulgate—Grotius, Cappell, Mills, Walton, Porter, Westcott, Dean Stanley, Dr. Roberts, and I might extend the list, but I adhere to the names already cited by me. The immense value and authority of the Vulgate, and its matchless importance as interpretative of the Greek text has been stated by *all* the great Protestant writers. This, however, is not the question now before the court.

He next opens another *spiracle* of the fish on the "working method of textual criticism," and finally in his fourteenth paragraph approaches the questions in debate. He begins at once to flounder, but the hook is too firmly fixed in his gills. Nothing can save him—he must drown, and his Episcopal *protégé* must go under with him. Oxford sciolism, though it wear a mitre or masquerade in "Roman collar," is not more respectable than any other sham, but is only the more pernicious in that its presumption in the present case is fully commensurate with its ignorance.

I have already asserted the Vicar's "mental kinship" with his great precursor, the cuttle-fish. In his effort to escape scrutiny he has bettered the trick of his prototype by injecting into this discussion all sorts of "*foreign matter and unsavory impurities*." His "strictures" for the most part are about as relevant to the real point as a disquisition on the Eocene, Miocene and Pleistocene periods in geology would be. Let me "discharge the color from these cuttle-fish secretions" by a short re-statement of the issue.

Bishop Kingdon put forward two propositions: *First*, that the question was between *Ipse* and *Ipsa*, and that the letter “a” in the latter was a misprint for the letter “e” in the former; and *second*, that the Catholic Church based on this misprint the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the ever blessed Mother of God. I challenged both propositions and charged the Bishop with suppressing, either through ignorance or malice, the fact that the reading of this place in Gen. iii. 15, was a very ordinary “various reading,” and that this was—IPSE, IPSA and IPSUM. Had he thus correctly put the matter, of course his little nursery-tale could not have been told, and his lecture would have lacked an embellishment. This story, let me say, was to the lecture as the very “snap of the whip.” This “misprint,” so called, was the only one of all those mentioned by the Bishop that, to his mind, entailed important and deplorable consequences.

To explain the origin of this three-fold reading, I said: “It is admitted on all hands that the Hebrew text, the fountain head, such as we have it now, is hopelessly ambiguous.” In support of this I contented myself with the authority of two such illustrious scholars as Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius. Does the Vicar offer one tittle of evidence to contradict their testimony? No! His tactics are those of the bull in a china-shop. This model of charity and urbanity simply calls them “princes of deceit,” “forgers” and perjured “liars,” and consigns them both to the “lake that burneth with fire and brimstone.” This harsh sentence he pronounces in the very teeth of a decision, binding on his own church, given by the Privy Council in the *Essays-and-Reviews* case in 1864, by which Hell and Eternal Punishment were dismissed and with costs from the creed of the Church of England. Tait (the late Archbishop of Canterbury), then Bishop of London, concurred in the judgment, while Longley and Thompson, respectively Archbishops of Canterbury and York, protested against it, but *cui bono*? The Anglican Church is a branch of the national police. Her ministers, high and low, are simply members of the force and must take their doctrine from the courts created by an Act of Parliament just as does the policeman who locks up an “ordinary drunk.”

Without going into details I will shortly vindicate the position I took on the authority of the scandalously maligned Belarmino and Baronius, viz.: that the Hebrew text in Gen. iii. 15, as elsewhere, is ambiguous.

My first witness will be the Vicar's newly-made acquaintance, De Rossi. I ask your readers to keep clearly in mind that I am not now discussing the relative merits of the three readings from a critical or doctrinal standpoint. I quote De Rossi here to show his opinion on the state of the Hebrew text: "Few, *doubtful* and altogether unreliable are the Hebrew MSS. in support of הַי (that is *Ipsa* I add) in which *yod* is *perhaps* a little *vaw*." If the Hebrew text were free from ambiguity why use the words "*doubtful*" and "*perhaps*" about its readings? Rev. Dr. Roberts, member of the New Testament Company of Revisors, says: "The truth is, that the real character of the existing Hebrew text, as respects absolute trustworthiness, is as yet undecided, and must remain so until certain great objects are accomplished. There must be a more scientific handling of all the materials of criticism. Manuscripts and versions of the Hebrew text must be more thoroughly investigated. . . . The science of Old Testament textual criticism is still in a comparatively imperfect condition, so that little can with certainty be said as to the value or antiquity of extant manuscripts." Dr. Kennicott in his work, "The present printed Hebrew text considered," Diss. 2, p. 222, gives fully the history of the text, and says it cannot be denied that it is now very defective through the fault of copiers, as the ablest Rabbins acknowledge. *Appleton's Cyclopaedia*, to which my opponent referred, says: "The Hebrew text of the Old Testament as we have it has already passed through many revisions. Of the primitive text we have little positive information." The Septuagint itself differs from the present Hebrew text in more than *two thousand* places. Of course I do not say nor admit that these defects and ambiguities in the Hebrew text at all affect the authority of Holy Scripture as a guide to truth; such a contention has never been sustained by the most ultra-rationalist of modern times. They affect the *forms* rather than the *substance* of words, and such is the case here.

Had the Bishop known the true state of the reading, or knowing it put it truly, he could not have told his little story. Hence, too, a little more knowledge and reflection might have led the Vicar to abstain from his attack on two such famous scholars as Bellarmine and Baronius, which I here declare to be a vile slander and calumny. Besides, it was uncanny in him to suggest to sarcastic readers the old picture of a "live ass braying over a dead lion."

He says I have not "fulfilled my penance"—that is, I have not proved my assertion "that *Ipsum* as a various reading disputes the place of *Ipse* and *Ipsa* therein." Before "slaying the dead over again," as the Greeks say, which I promise your readers very effectually to do, I will examine his "Strictures" on my proof. I will confine myself strictly for the present to the case I made in my "Résumé." I claim that I am entitled to a verdict against the Bishop and his Vicar though I should not utter another word. I can afford, however, to be indulgent, remembering that while "it is excellent to have a giant's power, it is tyrannous to use it as a giant." Such is the strength my case gives me.

I quoted so great a Biblical commentator as Cornelius à Lapide to this effect: "The reading here—Gen. iii. 15—is three-fold. The first is that of the Hebrew Codices, which have *Ipsum* . . . and so reads St. Leo and Lipomanus." Now I have no Biblical MSS. in either Hebrew, Greek or Latin in my Library; neither, I take it, has the Bishop nor his Vicar. The question is one of authority, and must be settled by the best that exists. À Lapide is among the very highest.

Here is my opponent's reply to him: "But Cornelius is a very weak witness for a start, feeble enough to condemn the whole case with costs off hand. He is made to say that the word *Ipsum* is found in Hebrew Codices!! What next? Cannot my opponent even weigh the evidence of his own witnesses? The Latin word *Ipsum* cannot possibly be in a Hebrew Codex." What shabby, disgraceful quibbling! Or is it ignorance of the simplest principle of ideology? I give an absolutely verbal translation. What à Lapide says is that the pronoun in the Hebrew is of the *neuter* gender, and to express

this mental concept in the Latin language, in which he was writing and thinking, too, no doubt, he uses as his *oral term* a corresponding Latin pronoun in the neuter gender—*Ipsum*, a simple pronoun. This is the principle and process of all translation from a foreign tongue into our own. First *ascend* from words to ideas, and then *descend* from ideas to words. Cornelius says that St. Leo uses the same gender, though from the grammatical exigency of his language he uses a *relative* pronoun in the neuter—*quod*: “Denuncians serpenti futurum *semen mulieris quod* noxii capitis elationem sua virtute contereret.” My opponent exclaims—“Well, *quod* is not *Ipsum*.” No, neither is it *Ipsa* nor *Ipsa*; it is a *fourth* reading, if you will—an additional burden on the Bishop’s back. He adds: “What Cornelius probably meant was that the Hebrew is against *Ipsa*.” “Probably meant!” What he *says* is that the Hebrew is *Ipsum* (which I will refer to later on) and not *Ipsa* or *Ipsa*. Did I choose to act the dolt I could “hoist him with his own petard.” When giving his wonderful quotations from the Fathers he forgot the silly objection he made to à Lapide’s words and exactly follows his example. “Irenæus,” he says, “in two passages has *Ipsa* in both.” Suppose that I should ask in his own words—“cannot my opponent even weigh the evidence of his own witnesses? Irenæus wrote in Greek; the Latin word *Ipsa* cannot be the one used by him.” I would simply merit the ridicule your readers have poured on him, and yet this Oxford Aristarchus has the insolence to say that, “notoriously in the case of Cornelius à Lapide, he had to stand at my elbow as my tutor!” Commend me to a ritualistic “Pope” for modesty! Again, Cornelius says Lipomanus adopts *Ipsum*. The Vicar evidently knows nothing about his writings. He says he comes “a little too late to give evidence in his own writings of ancient MS. readings.” Well, this is just the evidence Lipomanus does give. I do not want to enlarge on my “Résumé” here, but just a word. He was one of the most distinguished bishops at the Council of Trent, and made a “Catena” on Genesis, Exodus and the Psalms from the Latin and Greek authors. With characteristic recklessness the Vicar says: “If he (Lipomanus) does follow Leo he adopts *quod*, and

quod is not *Ipsum*." Alas, no; but he gives Latin versions of the Bible with that terrible *Ipsum* for which the Vicar has been thirsting. No, *quod* is not *Ipsum*! "O, the pity of it, Iago! O, Iago! the pity of it."

LETTER IV.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I resume the examination of my examiner. He is very evidently ashamed of his exhibition on à Lapide, and at once casts about for a soft spot to break his fall. It has, however, quickened his perception somewhat—he begins to hedge. He begs your readers to bear in mind that he is only seeing that I perform my task, for "the result," he says, "makes no difference to the main question to be discussed later on." To keep up his courage meanwhile he whistles out the innocent remark: "The case is pretty weak so far." Whose case? I ask your readers: his or mine?

My next witness was Chemnitz, a famous Protestant theologian, much respected by Catholic writers for his ability *and honesty*. He criticised the use of *Ipsa* in the Vulgate Bible sanctioned by the Council of Trent, at which time he wrote, and said that *Ipsum* was the correct reading according to ancient writers. This was said by him in the face of learned Europe. Bellarmine replied to Chemnitz. Of course, I apologize to the Vicar for using the great Cardinal's name. It is true the *Encyclo. Britannica*, never very partial to anything Catholic, says that his "life was a model of Christian asceticism"; but what matters that since a ritualistic Inquisitor puts him in "the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone"? At all events he was one of the best Hebrew scholars of his time. Did he call on Chemnitz to produce his MSS.? No: he admitted, in part, like an honest man, the truth his opponent had asserted. He knew it as well as Chemnitz. Here is

his answer—I translate: “I reply that the Vulgate is various here; for some codices have *Ipsē*, some *Ipsa*, and besides it is not contrary to the Vulgate edition should one be convinced that he ought to read *Ipsē* or *Ipsū*.” He then proceeds to discuss the authority for *Ipsa*, which I omit here.

How does the Vicar meet the testimony of Chemnitz backed up by Bellarmine, his opponent? “This witness,” he says, “is probably only witnessing against the corrupt reading of the common text approved by the Council of Trent.” “Probably only witnessing!” Whereas Chemnitz *says absolutely* that *Ipsū* is the correct reading, not *Ipsa*. What imbecility!

My next authority was a learned writer in the *Dublin Review*, who declared that “the weight of authority is in favor of the masculine or neuter, *Ipsē* or *Ipsū*.” This he supports by four great names in Biblical and theological learning—two Jesuits and two Dominicans, who in their works exhaust the whole subject. What says the Vicar in reply? “Witnesses altogether insufficient and the above remarks probably apply here.” “Probably apply!” He loves the “sweet reasonableness of *probabilities*. What an admirable *aide-de-camp* he would make in a weather bureau! His authority would be supreme on—*wind*.”

My next witness was another writer in the *Dublin Review*, whom I believe to be Cardinal Wiseman, one of the greatest linguistic scholars of modern times. Contrasting *Ipsa* with *Ipsū* he declares his belief that the latter was “the true reading.” The Vicar’s only reply here is that I forgot “the critical apparatus.” Quite satisfactory and characteristic.

Again I cite the Latin Bible of Tremellius and Junius which has *Hoc* instead of *Ipsū*. In a voice slightly more *falsetto* than his wont, the Vicar asks: “Is *Hoc Ipsū*?” Well, no; it is only *another* reading—one straw more.

The Bishop’s little diagram is being badly disfigured. He says he knows of *an edition of the same work* which has *Ipsū*. If I chose to claim it this is a piece of evidence for me, but as “I fear the Greeks even gift-bearing” I will have none of him. At the same time I do not believe he *knows* anything of the kind. Junius and Tremellius issued editions

separately, each on his own account. Either of these may have *Ipsum*, but I do not hesitate to say that the Vicar does not know of any copy of the *joint* edition which has *Ipsum*. So much for simple truth. What he means to be the effective part of his answer is, that "Tremellius from being a Jew was converted to Romanism, but *disgusted with Popery*, joined the Reformers"—those "utterly unredeemed villains," as the Vicar's "Pope," Littledale, calls them. And yet every one knows, O Vicar, that these very "villains" are "the rock whence you are hewn and the hole of the pit whence you are dug out"—that Ritualism is but a "bastard slip . . . of that multiplied brood." "Who can make clean the offspring of that great iniquity? Who but Thou alone, O God."—Job xiv. Logical minds will say that "Popery," pure and simple, the "poor Irish" and the "shillalah," with its sportive memories and tendencies, are respectable beside such a gilded abortion.

Again: I referred to the notes to the Douay Bible which give *Ipsa* or *Ipsum*. The "stricture" in reply gives strong evidence that the Vicar is frenzied. He says: "Concerning the Douay Version, which by its misleading note has brought so much trouble upon my opponent. It supplies not a reference to any authorities." This would disgrace anyone less pretentious than a ritualist "Pope." Have your readers seen the "trouble" it has brought upon me? I have not met it. What further "authorities" were required for the fact of the *currency* of the reading? But to cheer my opponent's heart I will give the "authorities" omitted from the Douay. I hope they will dry his tears.

In closing this part of my case I said I could give more evidence in support of *Ipsum*, but "enough is as good as a feast." After his brilliant "strictures" he still has the courage to say: "Well, some folks are easily satisfied . . . the whole thing is really nothing but a wind-bag." Your readers are now aware who these "folks" are, and from what direction the "wind" blows.

Now I advanced all these authorities for the *sole* purpose of showing how common the reading *Ipsum* was in all the literature of this question, yet my opponent says "I fail to establish

Ipsum." The truth of this I leave to your readers. But the fact is that hitherto I have been but *playing* with the unfortunate Vicar. I will now exhibit him as guilty of the most iniquitous performance, the most shameless, despicable and knavish piece of dishonesty to the public it has ever been my lot to meet. More than once he insinuated that I was suppressing something, expressed his anxiety about me in that regard, and prated about verification, &c. It is an old saying that when you see a man thus suspicious about his neighbor—look out for him. The Vicar well exemplifies its truth.

Your readers will remember his ignorant blundering about De Rossi, his own witness, and the whine of injured innocence in the apology he made for his "mistake." We then learned for the first time that his quotation was second-hand from Dr. Pusey, and that he "foolishly jumped to his conclusion." He has done a good deal of that sort of *jumping* in his "strictures," but as your readers will now see there was more *knavery* than *foolishness* in the jumper. I will now give him the "comfort" he says I promised him from De Rossi. In what I shall have to say about Hebrew my authorities will be the very best: Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon and Grammar, and Ewald's Hebrew Grammar.

Here let me clear the way for a full understanding of the position by the ordinary reader. In Hebrew the words corresponding to *Ipse*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*, are *Hu*, *Hi*, *Hu*, to speak popularly since I cannot reproduce here the Hebrew characters. It will be noticed that in Hebrew the masculine and neuter genders are the same, so that an authority for one is at the same time an authority for the other.¹ This fact explains

¹ It is not necessary to remind learned readers that there is no neuter gender in Hebrew. Here I desired to be plain, without a shadow of obscurity to the ordinary reader. I have therefore used the Hebrew words—*Hu*, *Hi*, *Hu*—as physical signs rather than strict grammatical forms, and have paralleled them with *Ipse*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*, to which they are respectively equivalent, for the purposes of my argument to the non-classical reader. See the last Letter of this *Rejoinder*, and my comments, on this topic, in the *Rebutter* to the "Third Letter."

and proves the truth of à Lapide's statement, and of the many commentators who agree with him, that the Hebrew codices have *Ipsum*, and also explains the many other commentators who say that the Hebrew has *Ipse*. *Hu*—masculine and neuter—supports them both. Let your readers bear this in mind in order fully to grasp the Vicar's fraud. See, too, à Lapide's comment in 6th parag. of the Vicar's 3d stricture.

Now for De Rossi. In his *first* paragraph, quoted by Pusey, he discusses "*Hi—Ipsa*" and says "it is not yet sufficiently certain . . . it is rather to be accounted among the errors in that (the Vulgate) version; and the most learned expositors and critics among Catholics so in fact account it." So we did not have to wait for an Anglican Bishop and a "sacerdotal pretender" to instruct us on the "tremendous importance" of *Ipsa*. How much of the Bible would they have anyway but for the Catholic Church? Pshaw! Notwithstanding the doctrinal chaos that exists in their own church, and the chasms that separate themselves, they are simply theological Robin Hoods as regards her.

De Rossi's *second* paragraph is the important one just now. He begins it: "But for the masculine *Hu* there stand—1) the consent of almost all Hebrew MSS., &c." I give this with absolute verbal correctness, simply translating the Hebrew characters into English—*Hu*. He follows this up by citations of Texts, Versions, MSS. editions and readings from Fathers and writers Greek, Latin and Syriac, but he gives the *words* of none. He then immediately concludes: "Which original authorities and witnesses, being most exceedingly grave and insurmountable, evidently demonstrate that the true reading of the sacred text is *Hu—Ipse*, *IPSUM*; and countless Catholic authors both before and since the Council of Trent follow this reading as the *true* and *prefer* it to the feminine." (The italics are mine.) Thereupon Pusey adds: "He (De Rossi) enumerates thirty-five and says that the *words* of most of them and the *places* where they occur are given by Ooster and Natalis Alexander." It is clear, then, that when De Rossi in the opening of his paragraph said that "for the masculine *Hu* there stand, &c.," he meant for the masculine or neuter "*Hu*

— *Ipse, IPSUM*,” “there stand, &c.,” though he does not point out which of his cited authorities are for the one, which for the other. Happily I can supplement and explain De Rossi here, for I have on my table Natalis Alexander, from which De Rossi quoted and to which he refers his readers. Remember my *penance* was “*to establish Ipsum.*”

Now turn we to the Vicar's letter of Dec. 15th. For distortion, suggestion of falsehood, and suppression of truth “none but itself can be its parallel,” as Martinus Scriblerus would say. The Vicar writes: “He (De Rossi) enumerates thirty-five ‘most exceedingly grave and insurmountable original authorities and witnesses’ in support of the masculine ‘*He* shall bruise the serpent's head.’” Is not this something monstrous? Of course De Rossi does nothing of the kind. The Vicar suppresses *Ipsum* in his quotation from De Rossi and interpolates the words, “*He* shall bruise the serpent's head.” His *cooking* and *garbling* of Pusey's quotation from De Rossi is so outrageously dishonest that I despair of making it plain. I do not wonder he feared “the limited area of the Institute” where the books could be passed around. As I have already said De Rossi's *second* paragraph, as given by Pusey, is divided into twelve heads. Under the first nine heads De Rossi gives the names of texts, versions, MSS. and editions; under the tenth and eleventh heads he gives the names, with a reference to the works only, of eleven writers; and the twelfth head is a statement of his own opinion. He immediately concludes “that the true reading of the sacred text is *Hu, Ipse, IPSUM.*” These are his very words. And he adds that “*countless Catholic authors* prefer this reading to the feminine.” These words close this part of the quotation from De Rossi in Pusey's book. Pusey then adds that De Rossi enumerates thirty-five of these Catholic authors who prefer *Hu, Ipse, IPSUM*, but Pusey gives none of them. In the face of this what stupor of soul, what paralysis of conscience swept over the Vicar which led him to say: “He (De Rossi) enumerates thirty-five ‘most exceedingly grave and insurmountable original authorities and witnesses’ in support of the masculine ‘*He* shall bruise the serpent's head,’” when he knows De Rossi says that the “witnesses and

authorities" cited under the eleven heads support the masculine or neuter—"Hu, Ipse, IPSUM," and the thirty-five Catholic authors are afterwards enumerated in addition according to Pusey. The Vicar wrote this in December last "for the benefit of Biblical students," and yet in his second letter, now under examination, he says in the 16th paragraph: "In all the commentaries I have read on Gen. iii. 15, I have never found *Ipsum* mentioned as a various reading, and that therefore I doubt if one exists." Good Heaven! He copies from De Rossi *right up* to the very word *Ipsum*, wilfully and wickedly suppresses it, avows he never heard of it, and then with hypocritical tears in his eyes complains that I "brand him with dishonesty and knavery to the public!" Some lovers of retributive justice among your readers, thinking of the sad fate of Bellarmine and Baronius, may ask—who "have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone?" The Vicar himself is fully entitled to any "comfort" which reflection on this question suggests.

I might here leave him to his sobering thoughts and pass on, but it might appear cruel. I now believe that he is so under the dominion of some physiological and psychological fatality in regard to religious truth and the Catholic Church, that he is not free to use his reason in the ordinary way. Charity plainly bids me pause in presence of his misfortune. But as he loves to "give information" I think I discharge the obligations of charity by enabling him "to stock up," though it now seems like calling in an army to arrest a house-breaker to offer further evidence of *Ipsum*. His mental condition can alone justify it.

From Natalis Alexander and other works in my hand, I think I can double De Rossi's "thirty-five," but I will give but a few. The Hebrew text according to Alexander is: *Ipsum conteret tibi caput*, though as I explained above some read *Ipse*, *Hu* being Hebrew for both. Unfortunately we have now but fragments of the splendid Hexapla (six-fold) Bible of Origen. The standard edition of these fragments is that of Montfaucon in two volumes. In volume one, p. 18, I find the Hebrew rendered: *Ipsum conteret tibi caput*. The SYRIAC VERSION has: *Ipsum conculabit caput tuum*, and the

two celebrated Syriac writers, St. Ephraem and Moses Bar-Cepha, mentioned by De Rossi, use *Ipsum* in their writings quoted by De Rossi; the SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH has: *Ipsum coneret tibi caput*; the Latin Bible of the celebrated Sanctes Pagninus has *Ipsum*; the Royal Polyglot Bible of Arias Montanus has *Ipsum*; Vatable's Bible has *Ipsum*; the famous Bible of Isidore Clarius has *Ipsum*; the Lyons Bible printed in 1550 has *Ipsa* in the text, but *Ipsum* in the margin; the Bible of Bellajo, Bishop of Paris, has the same; Lipomanus in his "Catena" gives a list of Latin copies which have *Ipsum*.¹ . . . Perhaps I ought to stop here. I wonder if I have *fulfilled my penance*! But I must mention Father Perrone's "Dogmatic Thesis on the Immaculate Conception," and lastly Cardinal Patrizi's "gem" of a book entitled: "De *Hu*, hoc est, de Immaculata Mariæ origine a Deo prædicta Romæ, 1853." It examines critically all the Texts, Editions, Versions and MSS. which have either *Ipse*, *Ipsa* or *Ipsum*. It was written the year before the definition of the Immaculate Conception, and the Cardinal adopts *Ipse* or *Ipsum* as the true reading.

So much in confutation, and for the instruction, of the Oxford twain. I feel but too keenly the humiliation of annihilating such antagonists, but I am saddened by the reflection that Oxford University, founded and reared under the auspices of the Catholic church, should in these days be responsible for such exponents of Biblical scholarship.

I have now proved beyond cavil the various reading for which I contended—*Ipse*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum* against the Bishop's diagram *Ipse-Ipsa*, and the Vicar's puny attempt to bolster it up. I have not noticed other readings in Gen. iii. 15, such as *Ille*, *Ilæc*, *Hic*, for which I can give authorities. In my next I will consider the effect of this proof.

POSTSCRIPT.

There are four famous Polyglot Bibles—the Complutensian, the Antwerp, the Parisian, and the London. I will here give my readers the results of my examination of them on our text.

¹ I have omitted here some Protestant text writers because I could not consult the originals.

THE COMPLETENSIAN gives the Hebrew with a Latin translation, *Ipsa*, which is alleged to be that of St. Jerome; the Chaldaic Paraphrase with a Latin translation, *Ipse*; the Septuagint Greek with a Latin translation, *Ipse*.

THE ANTWERP gives the Hebrew with a Latin translation, *Ipsa*; the Greek with a Latin translation, *Ipse*; the Chaldaic Paraphrase with a Latin translation, *Ipse*.

THE PARISIAN gives the Hebrew with a Latin translation, *Ipsa*; the Greek with a Latin translation, *Ipse*; the Chaldaic Paraphrase with a Latin translation, *Ipse*; the Syriac with a Latin translation, *Ipsum*; the Arabic with a Latin translation, *Haec*; the Samaritan with a Latin translation, *Ipsum*.

THE LONDON is superior to all the others. It was edited by the Rev. Dr. Bryan Walton, afterwards Anglican Bishop of Chester, and printed in 1653–1657, in six large folio volumes. It gives the Hebrew with an interlinear Latin translation, *Ipsum*; the Vulgate, *Ipsa*; the Greek with a Latin translation of Flaminius Nobilius, *Ipse*; the Syriac with a Latin translation, *Ipsum*; the Targum of Onkelos with a Latin translation, *Ipse*; the Samaritan Pentateuch with a Latin translation, *Ipsum*; the Samaritan Version with a Latin translation, *Ipsum*; the Arabic with a Latin translation, *Haec*.

These magnificent works I consulted in the Lennox Library, New York, and in Gore Hall, Harvard University. Walton's Polyglot is also in the Parliamentary Library at Ottawa.

I have also examined the following minor Polyglots: Bertram's (1586), Wolder's (1596), Hutter's (1599), and Bagster's (London).

BERTRAM (with notes by Vatable) has the Hebrew, Greek, and two Latin translations, *Ipse*, *Ipsum*.

WOLDER has the Greek, the Latin—*Ipse*, *Ipsum*, and Luther's German.

HUTTER has the Hebrew, Chaldaic, Greek, Latin—*Ipsa*, German, Italian.

BAGSTER has the Hebrew, Greek, Vulgate—*Ipsa*, German, Spanish, Italian, English.

I have also examined the following celebrated Bibles:

THE ZURICH (1543), which has *Ipsum*; the joint edition of

VATABLE and PAGNINI, which has *Ipsum*; the beautiful edition of Father HOUBIGANT, the French Oratorian, which has the Hebrew with a Latin translation—*Illud*; and the Hebrew Bible of ARIAS MONTANUS (1584) with Latin interlinear translation—*Ipsum*, to which I have already referred in the above Letter; the “*Biblia Illustrata*” of Galovius (1719), which has *Ipsa, Ipsum*.

I have, too, examined the works of the following learned Biblical Commentators:

SEBASTIAN MUNSTER, who gives *Illud*; PAUL FAGIUS, who discusses *Ipsa, Ipsa, Ipsum*, and prefers *Ipsa, Ipsum*; DRUSIUS, who says that nearly all the Latin MSS. have *Ipsa*, while some have *Ipsa* and others *Ipsum*; LUCAS BRUGENSIS the famous Catholic Biblical critic of Louvain University, who has a splendid note on the whole matter. He expresses his preference for *Ipsum* in these words: “*Fortassis autem commodius neutro genere transferatur, Ipsum conteret caput tuum.*” But as he knew much more about Catholic doctrine than either Bishop Kingdon or his Vicar, he does not hesitate to say that it makes no doctrinal difference which of the three readings is adopted. Speaking of *Ipsa* he says: “*Neque vero haec lectio Hebraeo repugnat. . . . Potest (autem) haec lectio . . . de Christi matre intelligi, ut serpentis caput contrivisse dicatur qui Eum genuit qui contrivit, qui diabolus Sua morte divicit, et nos ex ejus tyrannide in libertatem asseruit.*”

I also refer my readers to the critical edition of the Latin Old Testament by the learned Tischendorf and Heyse. These scholars give the three readings—*Ipsa, Ipsa, Ipsum*, in their note on Genesis iii. 15. See “*Postscript*” to the twenty-eighth Letter of this *Rejoinder*, where I again quote from Walton’s Polyglot and Tischendorf, on *Ipsa*.

VERCELLONE, too, in his peerless work—*The Various Readings of the Latin Vulgate Bible*, Vol. I., p. 13—gives the editions (with their dates) of Bibles with *Ipsum*, and then adds: “*Ignoramus utrum haec lectio (Ipsum) ex codicum fide, quod affirmare videtur Lippomanus, derivata sit—I do not know whether this reading (Ipsum) rests upon the authority of MSS., but Lippomanus seems to say that it does.*”

To my mind Lippomanus *absolutely* affirms it in these words: "*Ipse* conteret caput tuum; vel *juxta alia exemplaria*, *Ipsum* conteret caput tuum, scilicet semen mulieris." See Lippomanus' *Catena* on Genesis and Exodus.

Let me add to these authorities that of Calvin. In his "Commentary on Genesis," now before me, the text commented by him reads: *Ipsum* vulnerabit te in capite, et tu vulnerabis ipsum in calcaneo."

This may suffice to establish the point that the Latin reading of *Genesis* iii. 15, is not *Ipse*, *Ipsa*, simply, but *Ipse*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*.

LETTER V.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR.—In connection with the proof of *Ipsum* in my last letter I have to add a word anent à Lapide. In the sixth paragraph of his third letter the Vicar says: "Since suggesting an explanation of Cornelius à Lapide's statement that *Ipsum* was found in the Hebrew Codices, I have accidentally met with a corroboration of its accuracy from Cornelius himself. Wordsworth quotes his comment on Rom. xvi. 20, *which I trust my opponent will mark in his copy* with a reference to Gen. iii. 15: 'Alludit apostolus ad Gen. iii. 15, ut directe habent Hebraica *Hu Hic*, ID EST IPSUM SEMEN sive proles mulieris, puta Christus, conteret caput tuum.' Cornelius asserts that the Hebrew is masculine *Hic*, and that this masculine means *Ipsum Semen*, or Christ. This is almost identical with my explanation." Will your readers believe it? Here is another mutilation by suppression and interpolation. The Vicar cannot be safely trusted for anything. He appears to be utterly "gangrened" with dishonesty or incapacity, or both. He refers to Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, a contemptible "no-popery" ranter. Why did he not take the trouble "to

verify" him before asking me, with his usual insolence, to "mark my copy"?

Evidently he does not know the late Bishop Christopher as well as I do or he would not so "foolishly jump" again. Now here is that part of à Lapide's comment on Romans xvi. 20, *verbatim*: "Alludit (St. Paul) ad Gen. iii. 15—*Ipsa* (vel, ut directe habent Hebraea *Hu*, id est *Ipsum* semen, sive proles mulieris, puta Christus) *conteret caput tuum*." Compare this with the Vicar's quotation and you find that Wordsworth or the Vicar *suppresses* "*Ipsa*" and *interpolates* "*Hic*" after "*Hu*," so that it is simply worse than a "pious fraud" to say that "à Lapide asserts that the Hebrew is masculine *Hic*." Wordsworth died about three years ago—I hope he has escaped the hard fate of Bellarmine and Baronius. There is always a *locus penitentiae* for the living which the Vicar may turn to account.¹

Having, in my "Résumé," given what I considered sufficient evidence to support the various readings—*Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*—I said "that, according to Catholic teaching and authority, there is absolutely no difference in meaning between the three readings. . . . When properly understood the sense is the same to Catholic and Protestant alike." In proof I cited great Catholic writers living and dead, and I can expand the list indefinitely, but I desire to compress. In the face of these authorities my opponent calls my statement a "ludicrous fallacy"; but how does he meet me? By the most flagrant calumny and vituperation! I cannot point to a *single* instance of fair, manly investigation in the course of his "Strictures." They are made up, to a great extent, of the ingredients of the Witches' Cauldron:

Eye of newt, and toe of frog,
Wool of bat, and tongue of dog,
Adder's fork, and blind-worm's sting,
Lizard's leg, and owlet's wing,
For a charm of powerful trouble,
Like a hell-broth, boil and bubble.

¹ See Postscript to this Letter for a fuller *exposé* of Wordsworth's disgraceful ignorance and calumnies.

In the 15th paragraph of his third letter he says: "It may confidently be said that there cannot be found in the whole history of literature an instance of a misreading which has led to such grave and . . . awful consequences as this apparently slight change of an *e* to an *a* in the sacred text." The "awful consequences" he has told us is the "undue exaltation of the Holy Virgin." This has provoked many a smile among your readers, especially since the bad "snowing under" of the Bishop's diagram in my last letter. Lest the Vicar, however, with *unwonted* discourtesy, in a moment of gasping desperation, should say that "a man may smile and smile" and yet—have his part in the burning lake, I will change the venue from the Western (the Latin) church, where *Ipsa* has done so much mischief, and been of such "tremendous importance" to the "poor Irish" and "Romanists" generally, to the Oriental (the Greek) church. This church, let me say broadly, uses the Greek masculine—"Autos—He," in Gen. iii. 15, or having in mind the Syriac writers,—"*Auto—It*," to conform with the Greek what I have already said about St. Ephræm and Moses Bar-Cepha using the neuter *Ipsum* as stated by De Rossi. This church does not use *Ipsa* nor *Aute*, and yet it fully realizes the sublime, ecstatic and inspired prophecy of the Blessed Mary as expressed in the *Magnificat*: "For behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For He that is mighty hath done great things to me and holy is His name."

Willingly, for a while, do I leave the rough field of controversy for the more genial region of contemplation, and I ask your readers to go with me. And would that my lips might be touched with "coals from the Altar" as I utter the words I write. For, if there be one person in the New Creation of Grace who seems to hush to silence the discord of tongues, by the unbroken tranquillity of her sweet, patient love, it is the Madonna. Her life on earth was to nurse and foster Christ; and her glory in Heaven is to be enthroned by His side. What she was on earth, that she is still in the Church of God. She is the Mother of Jesus. All her vast power,—all her divinely-appointed influence,—the whole omnipotence of her intercession, as God has willed it in the sweet counsels of His love,—

her solitary grandeur in the church, as the one golden link which unites earth with Heaven,—the dazzling brightness of her high throne of Empire—all are hers that she may nurse and foster Jesus in the hearts of men, as in the special cradle of His own election. His is the only name under heaven given to men whereby they must be saved. All that Mary has and is, she has and is by and through her Son and for His sake. Cruel indeed are they, thankless and heartless, who would try to make a breach between the tender mother and her Child. By so much the more cruel are they than Herod and his satellites, by how much the love of Mary for her Son was and is more intense, more pure, more sacred, more spiritual, than that of the forlorn mothers of Judah for their bleeding little ones. And who of men or angels can measure the distance which separates these two loves?

Turn we then, from the Babel of confusion which the cold and sceptical Protestantism of my opponents has willed to thrust into the midst of the tenderest love of heaven, to satisfy the eyes of the soul and the affections of the human heart with the vision of Mary's growth in the Church of God. This is my present purpose. I wish to set before your readers the picture of Mary as the Greek Fathers *alone* have painted her from the very dawn of Christianity. In the earliest ages of the Primitive Church she occupies a position of unequalled dignity in the writings of the Fathers, Greek and Latin, and wins for herself sentiments of the tenderest devotion and titles of highest pre-eminence. I confine myself now for reasons already given, to the Greek Fathers.

I ask your readers, then, to accompany me while we search in the records of the *first six centuries* for the place which Mary held in the devotion and doctrine—in the heart and mind—of the early church. This is the period of the undivided church by which Anglicans and Ritualists at all events profess to be bound. I do not intend to rely upon one or two stray passages, obscure and incidental. I leave these to the self-willed enemies of Mary's empire—"to preachers who are compelled to hedge their expressions with so many cautions about false doctrine and practice in regard to her, that many a one

shrinks from a theme which, under other circumstances, he would rejoice to handle!" God help the poor weaklings! Nor could I hope to offer to your readers a true idea of antiquity by such a process. What they want is a chain of Fathers living in different parts of the world and in succeeding centuries, the uniformity of whose unconscious utterances may give them a real Apostolic tradition. The sublime portrait, therefore, which I propose to exhibit, is not the work of one hand. It is the collective labor of centuries. I have for the most part, the Greek and the Latin of the Greek before me.

In the first century we cannot, of course, expect much assistance. It was an age of martyrs and evangelists, not of writers, unless we except the composers of the New Testament. Yet there exists a document, which is, by many learned critics, assigned to the Apostolic age. It consists of a letter written by the priests and deacons of Achaia, in which they narrate the acts of the martyrdom of St. Andrew the Apostle. Even those who deny its authenticity (as the Protestant Cave) are compelled, by the evidence of facts, to assign it a place among the earliest records of the Church. Gallandus, Plazza and Natalis Alexander leave no doubts about it. In this letter St. Andrew, speaking of our Lord, says that "He was born of a *blameless* Virgin."

There is, besides, another document, which is considered by some to be the work of an Apostle, though the preponderance of authority is apparently in favor of the contrary opinion. I may as well, however, introduce it here. It is, at all events, a most important witness to the Apostolic tradition of which we are in search, not only because it is the oldest and most famous of Oriental Liturgies, but also because the forms of expression, which I am about to quote, *occur in all the Liturgies of the East*. In the Liturgy, then, which is called after the name of St. James the Apostle, I find the following words in *four* several parts of the Mass; "The most holy, immaculate, most glorious mother of God, our lady and every-Virgin Mary." And, again, "All-blameless, and mother of our God, more to be honored than the cherubim, and more glorious beyond com-

parison than the seraphim." And, once more, she is thus invoked: "O Sanctified Temple!" My authorities here are the illustrious Assemani, a Syrian Maronite family of four famous Orientalists.

My Greek witnesses for the second century are St. Justin Martyr (A.D. 120-165) and Irenæus (120-200). St. Justin represents Palestine, and St. Irenæus Asia Minor and Gaul—or rather he represents St. John the Evangelist, for he had been taught by the Martyr St. Polycarp, who was the intimate associate of St. John, as also of other Apostles.¹ St. Justin says: "We know that He, before all creatures, proceeded from the Father by His power and will, . . . and by means of the Virgin became man, that by what way the disobedience arising from the serpent had its beginning, by that way also it might have had an undoing. For Eve, being a virgin and undefiled, conceiving the word that was from the serpent, brought forth disobedience and death; but the Virgin Mary, taking faith and joy, when the angel told her the good tidings, that the spirit of the Lord should come upon her and the power of the Highest overshadow her, and therefore the Holy one that was born of her was Son of God, answered, 'Be it to me according to Thy word.'" *Dialog. Tryph.* 100. St. Irenæus writes: "With a fitness, Mary the Virgin is found obedient, saying, 'Behold Thy handmaid, O Lord; be it to me according to Thy word.' But Eve was disobedient; for she obeyed not, while she was yet a virgin. As she, having indeed Adam for a husband, but as yet being a virgin . . . becoming disobedient, became the cause of death both to herself and to the whole human race, so also Mary, having the predestined man, and being yet a virgin, being obedient, *became both to herself and to the whole human race the cause of salvation* . . . and on account of this the Lord said that the first should be last and the last first. . . . And so the knot of Eve's disobedience received its unloosing through the obedience of Mary, for what Eve, a virgin, bound by incredulity, that Mary, a virgin, unloosed by faith." *Adv. Hær.* 3, 22, 34.

¹ See Newman's *Letter to Pusey*.

And again: "As Eve by the speech of an angel was seduced, so as to flee God, transgressing His word, so also Mary received the good tidings by means of the angel's speech, so as to bear God within her, being obedient to His word. And, though the one had disobeyed God, yet the other was drawn to obey God; *that of the Virgin Eve the Virgin Mary might become the advocate*. And, as by a virgin the human race had been bound to death, by a virgin it is saved (or loosed), the balance being preserved, a virgin's disobedience by a virgin's obedience."—*Ibid.* v. 19. Cardinal Newman, commenting on these two writers (with Tertullian), says: "They unanimously declare that she (Mary) was *not* a mere instrument in the Incarnation, such as David or Judah may be considered; they declare she co-operated in our salvation not merely by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon her body, but by specific holy acts, the effect of the Holy Ghost within her soul . . . that as Eve made room for Adam's fall, so Mary made room for our Lord's reparation of it; and thus . . . it follows that, as Eve co-operated in effecting a great evil, Mary co-operated in effecting a much greater good." Can any logic beat that? Let your readers peruse Newman's historic letter to Pusey—the logical Pusey who described Bishop Colenso's teaching as "Colenso's heathenism," and yet called the Church of England, in which Colenso lived and died a Bishop, a "branch of the Catholic Church"! Of course other members of the same church thought Pusey the bigger "heathen" of the two (as I will show later on) because of his "Popery" and "Romanism."

I turn now to the earlier part of the third century, and begin with St. Hippolytus, Bishop of Porto, who was a pupil of St. Clement of Alexandria, and coeval with the great Origen. In one of the fragments of his writings, which have been preserved, he has these words: "And the ark of incorruptible woods was the Saviour. . . . But the Lord was without sin, made as regards His human nature of incorruptible woods, that is, of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost, covered over within and without, as it were, with the most pure gold of God the Word." This likening of Mary to the incorruptible wood, out of which Christ, the Ark, was made, is a favorite comparison with the

Fathers, as we shall have occasion to see. How happily it suggests the purity of her conception.

St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (the wonder-worker), Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, another of Origen's pupils, is an illustrious witness to Catholic tradition about Mary in this century. He was certainly present at the first council of Antioch, convened to condemn Paul of Samosata, in A.D. 264. He died in the following year. This illustrious Saint speaks of Mary as "the pure and chaste and immaculate and holy Virgin Mary"; again, as "the immaculate flower of life"; as "the ever verdant Paradise of immortality"; as "the perennial fountain"; as "the ever verdant Vine." *Homily on the Annunciation, Migne, PP. Graeci, Tome x., p. 1152.* He compares her in the same place to the Virgin soil out of which Adam was formed, when the earth was not yet subject to the curse. He describes her nearly in the same words as St. Hippolytus—"the Ark covered over with gold from within and from without." In a second Homily on the same subject he introduces the Archangel Gabriel as addressing her on the day of the Annunciation in the following terms: "All the celestial Powers salute thee, the holy Virgin, by my mouth. And what is more, He who is Lord of all the celestial powers has chosen thee, the holy and all-adorned one, from among all creatures; and by thy holy, and chaste and pure and immaculate womb, the bright-shining Pearl comes forth for the salvation of the whole world; since thou hast been made the holy one, and more glorious, and more pure, and more saintly than all the rest of human kind, having a mind whiter than snow, and thy soul more purified than the finest gold."

Again he calls her "an Immaculate Virgin"; "incapable of corruption"; "God's rational Paradise"; "Another Heaven upon earth"; "The pure Bridal-chamber of the generation of the Word according to the flesh"; "The Immaculate Virgin Mother of an orphaned world"; "The Living Temple of God."

It is my duty here to remind your readers that doubt has been cast upon the authorship of these homilies. Cardinal Bellarmine and Dupin doubted about them, but I must also add that the critics are ten to one against them, including the

learned Protestant, Gerard Voss. For us the question is comparatively unimportant; for every thing conspires to assign them an early date. And, moreover, I am not at present seeking to prove a doctrine by the authority and weight of great names, but to discover the general mind of the early church respecting the Mother of God. And, therefore, whether these homilies were preached by the illustrious Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, or by St. Chrysostom, or by Macarius is comparatively of small importance.

My next witness shall be St. Dionysius of Alexandria (A.D. 247), the great champion of the Catholic faith against the heresy of Paul of Samosata. In a letter which he wrote to this heresiarch he speaks of our Lady as "Christ's Holy Tabernacle, not made with hands." He says that "Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin Mary, the Holy Ghost descending upon her; and as He alone knew the order of His conception and Birth, preserving the Mother incorruptible and blessed from head to foot." He, too, like St. Gregory, calls her "a Virginal Paradise." *Labbeum*, T. 1, pp. 900-907. Moreover, these expressions are not merely the individual testimony of the Alexandrian Patriarch—they have a sort of synodical authority, for the letter was written by the authority, and as the expression of the doctrine, of the Antiochene Fathers.

POSTSCRIPT.

In his *Strictures* on my *Rejoinder* the Vicar does not dare to deny my charges against Bishop Wordsworth, whom he had the misfortune to introduce into this discussion. They are literally true. On turning to Wordsworth's *Greek Testament*, Vol. 2, p. 272, I find that this learned bigot has actually been guilty of the literary forgery which I have pointed out in the foregoing letter. I will now set forth the whole matter, and thus give my readers the opportunity to pronounce judgment on the honesty and knowledge of Catholic doctrine of another Anglican Bishop.

In his note on *Romans* xvi. 20, Wordsworth writes:

"Satan now rules at Rome, but *the Seed of the Woman* has

bruised the serpent's head, according to the first prophecy in Holy Scripture (Gen. iii. 15).

"After the recent perversion of that prophecy, in the Papal Decree on the Immaculate Conception (Rome, Dec. 8, 1854), wherein this act of bruising the serpent's head is applied to the *Virgin Mary*, as *her* special prerogative, it is not irrelevant to cite the following testimony to the truth, from the pen of the learned Romanist Commentator, *Cornelius à Lapide*, in his note here (Rom. xvi. 20):

(À Lapide's *very words* from his commentary now before me):

"Alludit (St. Paul) ad *Genes.* iii. 15, IPSA (vel ut directe habent Hebraea, *Hu*, id est Ipsum Semen, sive, proles mulieris, puta Christus), conteret caput tuum."

(A Lapide's words according to Wordsworth):

"Alludit apostolus ad *Genes.* iii. 15, ut directe habent Hebraica *Hu* HIC, id est Ipsum Semen, sive Proles mulieris, puta Christus, conteret caput tuum."

Now, is not this an infamous specimen of literary forgery? He suppresses *Ipsa* from à Lapide's text, and interpolates *Hic*! Are all Anglican Bishops and Vicars alike? Forty years ago two well-known Anglican Ministers who shone among the brightest lights of Exeter Hall—the Rev. Dr. McGee and Rev. Dr. Todd—deliberately *forged* and gave to the world in its pretended Latin original, a Papal Brief, from Pope Gregory XVI. to the Bishops of Great Britain and Ireland. And even though convicted, they would not confess, until the forgery had accomplished its end. History repeats itself to-day in Wordsworth and the Vicar. The latter is not only convicted of literary forgery—and on his own confession—but he scattered broadcast the forged speech of Bishop Strossmayer because he thought it "advantageous to our church," as he wrote to the New York *Church Eclectic*. And worse than that—for, even after I had convinced him that the alleged speech was a forgery, he publicly solicited "*two-cent*" subscriptions to enable him to circulate it more widely! And yet Bishop Kingdon continues to him his license to preach what they agree to consider—the *Gospel*! In the face of these blazing facts is it not a fair, legitimate inference that the Anglican Church approves and admires, or certainly does not disapprove and con-

demn, the crime of forgery, provided only it be "advantageous" to Anglicanism?

My readers will note that Wordsworth, in the above quotation, is guilty of the same idiotic impertinence as Bishop Kingdon, in what he says about the "perversion" of *Gen.* iii. 15, and the "tremendous importance" of *Ipsa*. Probably he now knows better. Let me admonish Bishop Kingdon to improve his opportunities before "the night cometh."

R. F. Q.

LETTER VI.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—I continue my testimony from the 3d century. St. Clement of Alexandria, the great Origen's great master, compares Mary to the church: "O mystic marvel! The universal Father is one, and one the universal Word; and the Holy Ghost is one and the same everywhere. One also is the only Virgin mother. I love to call her the Church. . . . But she is at once Virgin and Mother—pure as a virgin, loving as a mother. And calling her children to her she nurses them with holy milk, viz.: with the Word become her child." I follow here "Ante-Nicene Library," vol. IV., p. 142, almost *verbatim*. Again. The mighty Origen (Homily VI. on Luke) speaking of the angel's words—"Hail full of grace," says: "For Mary alone is this salutation reserved." And (Homily VII. on Luke) he proves from the words of Elizabeth that our Saviour could never have slighted, or reproved, as some early heretics asserted, his blessed mother. He writes: "Elizabeth filled with the Holy Ghost said: Blessed art thou among women. If Mary is pronounced *blessed* by the Holy Ghost how could the Saviour deny her?" Speaking of Mary's visit to Elizabeth (Homily IX.) and that at the sound of Mary's voice Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost, he says: "If

in one hour she (Elizabeth) had gained so much, we may conjecture how much John gained in three months by Mary's presence with Elizabeth." Finally censuring those who spoke in an unbecoming manner of the "blessed Woman," he says: "In what respect does such language differ from that of those who pour abuse on others on the public streets, and whose words are unworthy of any serious attention?"

Again. St. Archelaus, Bishop of Caschar in Mesopotamia, in his disputation with the Heresiarch Manes writes: "Just as all the Law and the Prophets are summed up in two words, so also all our hope is made to depend (hinges) on the birth by the blessed Mary." *Ante-N. Lib.*, vol. xx., p. 395.

To close this century with another extract from Second Homily of St. Gregory. He says: "With what words of laudation, then, shall we describe her (Mary's) Virgin-dignity? With what indications and proclamations of praise shall we celebrate her stainless figure? With what spiritual song or word shall we honor her who is most glorious among the angels? She is planted in the house of God like a fruitful olive that the Holy Spirit overshadowed; *and by her means are we called sons and heirs of the kingdom of Christ.* She is the ever-blooming paradise of incorruptibility, wherein is planted the tree that giveth life, and that furnisheth to all the fruits of immortality. *She is the boast and glory of Virgins, and the exaltation of Mothers. She is the sure support of the believing, and the succourer (or example, Katorthoma,) of the pious.* She is the vesture of light, and the domicile of virtue (or truth). She is the ever-flowing fountain, wherein the water of life sprang and produced the Lord's incarnate manifestation. She is the monument of righteousness; AND ALL WHO BECOME LOVERS OF HER, AND SET THEIR AFFECTIONS ON VIRGIN-LIKE INGENUOUSNESS AND PURITY, SHALL ENJOY THE GRACE OF ANGELS." *Ante-Nicene Library*, vol. xx., p. 128. This is an excellent Protestant translation of some of the Catholic Fathers in 24 vols. To any of your readers desirous of reading those beautiful Homilies of St. Gregory on the blessed Virgin I will be happy to loan my copy.

The most eminent source from which I am able to gather

the sense of the Church in the Fourth Century on the dignity and prerogation of Mary is the Father next on my list. It is St. Ephrem, the Syrian, who was ordained priest by St. Basil, one of the four Doctors of the Greek Church. His praises are celebrated by St. Gregory, of *Nyssa*, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, Theodoret, St. Jerome and others, who call him "the Master of the World," and "the Euphrates of the Church"; and who tell us that his writings were publicly read in many churches next after the Divine Scriptures. He died in 379. He is a witness for the Syrians proper and the neighboring Orientals, in contrast to the Græco-Syrians.

St. Ephrem, then, thus speaks of our Lady in a Homily, which is dedicated to her praises. He calls her "the new mystical Heaven," "the Vine fruitful in sweet odors," "Fountain issuing forth from the House of God." We have, from the Syrian and Greek Codices and on the authority of Voss and the Assemani, certain prayers to Mary, which he composed. His fourth prayer is, from beginning to end, so illustrious an example of the devotion of the Eastern Church to her at this early time that I wish I could give it entire, but I must abridge:

"My Lady, most holy Mother of God, full of grace, receptacle of the divinity of thy only begotten Son, fiery throne far more glorious than the four-formed" (of Ezechiel) "of the immortal and invisible Father, all-pure, all-immaculate, wholly without spot, . . . wholly most blessed, all-inviolate, all-venerable, all-honorable, wholly to be blessed and praised, and honored and desired, Virgin in soul, and body and mind, throne of the King who sitteth above the Cherubim, Heavenly Gate through which we hasten from earth to Heaven, Bride of God by whom we are reconciled, unexpected miracle, . . . Manifestation of the hidden mystery of God, Invincible defence, Powerful aid, Living fountain, Exhaustless ocean of divine and unutterable graces and gifts, Height more sublime than that of the heavenly powers, Common glory of nature, Exuberance of all things noble, Queen of all after the Trinity, the other Paraclete after the Paraclete, and after the Mediator the Mediatrix of the whole world, Chariot of the intellectual

Sun,—that true light which lighteneth every man coming into the world, the Immaculate Vesture of Him who clothes Himself with light as with a garment, Bridge of the whole world that leadeth us to the highest heaven, higher and far more glorious beyond all comparison than Cherubim and Seraphim, Brightness of the Angels, Safety of men, Mother and hand-maid of that Star which knows no setting, Brightness of the true and mystical day, Abyss of the unsearchable goodness of God, most firm foundation of the true faith, Place most easily containing Him who knows no place, fulness of the graces of the Trinity, holding the second place after the Trinity, Security of those who stand, Restoration of those who fall, Arouser of the lukewarm, treasure of undefiled life, Cloud dropping down celestial dew on the earth, Ladder by which heavenly angels descend to us, Haven to the tempest-tost, Joy of the afflicted, Patroness of the injured, Help of the deserted, Strength of the weak, Succor of those who are weighed down, Staff of the blind, Saving Guide of the wanderers, Sure Help in troubles, holy ark by whom we have been saved from the deluge of iniquity, unconsumed Bush which Moses saw who looked on God, Golden Censor in which the word, setting light to the flesh, filled the world with sweet odors, and the deviations of disobedience were utterly consumed, Tablet on which God has written, Candelabrum of seven lights whose splendor surpasses the rays of the sun, Holy Tabernacle which the spiritual Beseleel set up, Royal Chariot, vessel filled with Manna, enclosed Garden, sealed Fountain whose most pure streams water the whole world, Rod of Aaron that buds by the power of God, Fleece of Gideon wet with dew, Book written by the hand of God, by which the handwriting of Adam has been torn up, Mountain of God, Holy mountain, in which it hath pleased God to dwell, Masterpiece of the tremendous economy of Grace, lovely dwelling place of the divine abasement, Reconciliation of the world, Model of Virginity, precious vision of prophets, most manifest fulfilment of all prophecy, ceaseless voice of Apostles, invisible confidence of those who conquer, my lady, my joy, *my sleepless advocacy with God!* Behold my faith, and my heaven-inspired desire, and

as one having compassion and able to help me; and since thou art the Mother of Him who alone is good and merciful, receive my soul and deign to place it, *by thy mediation and defence*, at the right hand of thy only begotten Son, and in the repose of His elect and saints. I have no other help and defence save thee. In thee I hope I shall obtain my wish. In thee I glory. Do not by reason of my many sins turn thy face away from me, thy unworthy servant. For thou hast the will and the power, since thou hast generated one of the Trinity. Thou hast the means of persuading and bending. Thou hast those hands, with which in an unspeakable way thou didst carry Him, those breasts with which thou gavest Him milk. Call to mind the swaddling clothes, and the rest of His bringing up from infancy. Join to thine what are His own—the Cross, the Blood, the Wounds, by which we are saved. Do not remove far from me, I beseech thee, thy protection, but aid and protect, and ever be at hand. For He is thy debtor Who said—honor thy father and thy mother; and how much the rather will He, who willed to be reckoned among servants, observe the law of gratitude and His own decree in thy regard who served Him in that generation which was redemption. *Wherefore also considering it as His own glory to yield to thy intercession, He fulfils thy petitions, as though it were an obligation.* Only despise not me unworthy; nor let the foulness of my actions stay thy immense mercy, mother of my God, fondest above measure of names. For there is no stronger pledge of victory than thy help. For thou hast wiped away all tears from the face of the earth. Thou hast filled the creation with every kind of benefit. Thou hast brought gladness to things in heaven, salvation to things on earth. Thou hast reconciled the creature, and appeased the creator. Thou hast lowered the angels and exalted men. Thou hast mediated by thyself between things above and things below. . . . We have thee as the protectress of our salvation. The congregation of Christians has thee as its strongest wall of defence. Thou hast opened the gates of Paradise. Thou hast prepared an ascension to heaven. Thou hast associated us with thyself and God. By thee, O Immaculate, and thee only, all glory, honor, sanc-

tity, has been, is, and ever will be, from the time of the first Adam even to the end of the world, to Apostles, Prophets, the just, and to the humble of heart. And in thee rejoice the whole creation, filled with grace. And I confide in thee, for thy sake, who didst most truly bring forth, according to the flesh, the true God, to whom is due all glory, honor and adoration with the unoriginated Father, and His all-holy and good and life-giving Spirit, now and ever and throughout all ages—Amen.” I have given but half of this wondrous prayer. Subtract from it all we may be inclined to set down to the glowing warmth of Oriental devotion and there yet remains enough, one would think, to startle and astonish those who have been led to imagine that the *cultus* of Mary is a corruption of comparatively recent times—the result of a *horrid misprint* (!) of “A” for “E” forsooth! St. Ephrem has literally ransacked Old and New Testament, in order to find a type of Mary in *every thing* which has *in any way been brought near to God*. The exalted pre-eminence which she holds in this prayer can scarcely find its parallel in our modern books of Catholic piety. And nothing can be more unreserved and undoubting, than the confidence which he expresses from first to last in the power of her Intercession and Patronage.

I pass on, omitting, for brevity's sake, quotations from the famous St. Chrysostom, and from St. Epiphanius who speaks eloquently for Egypt, Palestine and Cyprus, to the fifth century. I begin with St. Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, and a disciple of Chrysostom. After his consecration to the Episcopate of Cyzicum he preached a celebrated sermon in presence of the heresiarch Nestorius, and in the latter's own cathedral, on “The Praises of Mary, etc.” These are his opening words: “The Holy Virgin Mary, Mother of God, has called us together in this place; she, that pure treasure of virginity—the spiritual paradise of the Second Adam—the chosen place in which the two natures of Jesus Christ were united; she, the festival of saving reconciliation—the bridal-chamber in which the Word of the Father espoused our human nature; She, the living bush which the fire of Divine parturition did not consume; She of a truth that light cloud, who bore in her body

Him who sitteth above the Cherubim; She, that most pure Fleece, watered with celestial dew, with which the Shepherd has clothed his sheep; She, handmaid and Mother, Virgin and Heaven itself; She, the only Bridge by which God came down to men; She, the awful Loom of the Incarnation, in which the tunic of that union was woven after an ineffable manner, whose weaver was the Holy Ghost, and the power overshadowing from on high; the wool of which was the old fleece of Adam; the warp, the unpolluted Flesh derived from the Virgin; the shuttle, the immeasurable grace of Him who bore it; the Artificer the Word of God descending."

My next witness is St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, who was prominently connected, like St. Proclus, with the Nestorian heresy. The Fathers had just arrived at Ephesus, previous to the first session of the council, when St. Cyril preached as follows before them all:

"Hail Mary, Mother of God, venerable Treasure of the whole world, inextinguishable Lamp, Crown of Virginity, *Sceptre of Orthodoxy*, indestructible Temple, chosen place of Him who knows no place, Virgin and Mother . . . Hail thou, who didst contain in thy holy and virginal womb the uncontainable; thou, by whom the Trinity is glorified, *by whom the precious Cross is made known and adored in all the world*; by whom heaven is made glad, by whom angels and archangels rejoice; by whom devils are put to flight; by whom the tempter, the evil one, fell from heaven; by whom the fallen creature is received up into heaven; by whom the whole creation, fettered in the chains of an insane idolatry, has come to a complete knowledge of the truth; by whom holy baptism is given to them that believe, by whom the oil of gladness; by whom churches have been founded everywhere; *by whom all the nations are brought to penance*! And what shall I say more? By whom the only-begotten Son of God shone forth, a light to them that sat in darkness and in the shadow of death; by whom prophets prophesied; by whom Apostles preached salvation to the Gentiles; by whom the dead are raised to life; by whom kings reign through the grace of the Holy Trinity. *What man is there who may enumerate the multitudinous graces of Mary?* . . . O miracle! The wonder strikes me dumb with amazement."

The next whom I shall quote is St. Basil of Seleucia, one of the Fathers present at the Council of Chalcedon—the fourth

Ecumenical Council, A.D. 451. He addresses Mary in this wise: "O sacred womb which received God; in which the handwriting of sin was torn to pieces." He exclaims, "what gifts sufficiently worthy of her can we offer, of whom all earthly things are unworthy?" He calls her "The Amaranthine Paradise of Chastity;"—" *Mediatrix between God and Man*"—"Temple truly worthy of God;" and he bursts out into the following ardent exclamation—"O all-holy Virgin, of whom he who says all that is venerable and glorious *errs not from the truth, but fails in equalling thy merit.*"

St. James, Bishop of Batnae in Mesopotamia, in the district of Sarug, joins the fifth with the sixth century. He is always quoted in nearly all the religious books of the Syrians with St. Ephrem, and is called "the flute of the Spirit"—"the Harp of the Church of the Faithful." In a sermon on the Blessed Virgin, he says: "If any stain or defect had been in her soul (the Lord) would have sought out another mother for Himself, who would be free from all sin." *Bib. Orien. Clem.—Vat.* vol. 1, p. 301. Simon Assemani, Romæ, 1719.

To pass on to the sixth century. I content myself with two witnesses. The first shall be St. Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, an illustrious defender of the Catholic faith against the heresy of the Monothelites. In his synodical letter which he addressed to Sergius, the heretical Patriarch of Constantinople, he speaks of "Mary the holy and illustrious, and heavenly-minded, and free from all stain in body and soul and mind." Again in a sermon on the Annunciation, published by Father Ballerini in his *Sylloge*, he introduces the Archangel Gabriel as addressing our lady in this wise:

"Hail, Mother of Supercelestial Joy! Hail, nurse of sublimest joy! Hail, metropolis of saving gladness! Hail, joint cause of immortal joy! Hail, mystical inn of ineffable joy! Hail, admirable soil of unspeakable joy! Hail, altogether blessed-fountain of unfailing joy! Hail, God bearing heir-loom of eternal joy! Hail, most flourishing plant of vivifying joy! Hail, unwedded Mother of God! Hail, Virgin inviolate after parturition! Hail vision most eminently wonderful of all wonders! Who can declare thy glory? Who can tell the wonder that thou

art? Who shall dare to proclaim thy greatness? Thou hast adorned human nature. Thou hast surpassed the orders of angels. Thou hast thrown into the shade the brightness of Archangels. Thou hast shown the high seats of the Throne to be beneath thee. Thou hast put down the height of the Dominations. Thou hast outstripped the noblest of the Principalities. Thou hast weakened the strength of the Powers. Thou hast come forth a Virtue more powerful than the Virtues. Thou hast surpassed with earthly eyes the many-eyed Cherubim. Thou hast ascended with the divinely agitated wings of the soul above the six-winged Seraphim. Thou hast, lastly, far surpassed every creature, inasmuch as thou shinest with a purity above every creature, and didst receive within thee the Creator of all creatures, and didst bear him in thy womb, and didst give him birth, and hast alone of all creation become Mother of God."

My second witness is St. Anastasius, the Sinaite, who says :

"And who (tell me, I pray) whether of men or devils will dare to say, that she, who is of the same essence with God, as regards the flesh, is not after the image and likeness of Him, who was born of her? For how is she mother of such a Son, if she bear not in herself whole and unbroken the image of her offspring?"

Who can be so blinded with prejudice as not to perceive in these quotations, borrowed from successive centuries, an Apostolic tradition, which is as far removed from the least heterodox conception of Mary professed by my opponents and the Anglican church generally as Heaven is from earth. Voices reach us from Syria,—from Mesopotamia,—from Phœnicia,—from Constantinople,—from Jerusalem and Mount Sinai which, one and all, conspire in ascribing to Mary a solitary pre-eminence in God's creation of grace. Types are borrowed everywhere from the Old Testament of all that is most holy and most singular in Divine Benediction. In giving expression to their inward perception of the beauty and holiness of Mary, the writers have exhausted the rich sources of the Greek tongue; and if we would desire to put into words our own thoughts we can only repeat the language that was long ago familiar to them. The Catholic Church in the East and in the West simply took up the note of Mary's holy song: "Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me *blessed*"

—and went forth resounding it throughout the four corners of the globe.¹

My purpose in this letter and in my last was that your readers should see what the Saints and Doctors in the Primitive *Greek Church* thought of our blessed Lady—how they spoke of her; what was the picture of her they had ever before their eyes—and this, remember, in regions where “IPSA” was unknown! I ask your readers to examine this picture well, to take in its background, to study each finishing stroke of the pencil. Then put in the foreground Bishop Kingdon and his Vicar holding up their little diagram—“*Ipsa-Ipsa*” while they weep over the “awful consequences” of the “misprint.” What a spectacle to men and angels!

LETTER FROM THE VICAR.

IPSE, IPSA—MR. QUIGLEY’S REJOINDER—A CAUTION.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I have no desire to intrude out of my turn, but as Mr. Quigley has invited a confiding public to borrow what he calls an “Excellent Protestant translation” of the so-called Homilies of S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, I am in duty bound to give them a caution.

Let any one who may avail himself of Mr. Quigley’s offer turn, as he directs, to p. 128 of vol. xx. in *Clarke’s Ante-Nicene Library*, then let him refer to the Table of Contents and the Introductory notice and he will find that the translator has taken special care to separate between the “Acknowledged” and the “Dubious or Spurious” writings of the Saint, and that the latter, wherewith the Church has for centuries been deceived, are very copious. He will next observe that Mr. Quigley’s quotation is taken from this latter part without even a hint as to its character.

A reference to Smith and Wace’s *Dictionary of Christian*

¹ See Father Harper’s *Peace through the Truth*, Vol. 1, p. 401.

Biography, p. 737, shows that these Homilies belong not to the merely *Dubious* but to the *Undoubtedly Spurious* writings attributed to Gregory.

I abstain at present from further remark, although most of Mr. Quigley's citations are equally misleading.

Yours truly,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,
Priest of the Mission Church.

April 23, 1888.

See reply to above letter in the "P. S." to my next letter.

R. F. Q.

LETTER VII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—Though it seems a debasing of the mind further to refute the Vicar's ravings, I have not yet done with him. I propose now to exhibit him in a light so detestably lurid that the sins he so falsely charged against the Catholic Church pale into veniality—even were they true. There is no reason, as things go, why I should not make as much of Anglican misdeeds as the Vicar has tried to make of ours; only "bad luck to us," says Cardinal Newman, "we have never kept a record of Protestant scandals." The Catholic mind does not take to that sort of argument, and, because it does not forget that non-observance of the Decalogue does not abrogate it. The ritualistic mind, on the contrary, as we see it displayed in the Vicar, would deny the most rigid mathematical deduction if seen to involve any concession to hated Rome. In this connection, however, I will content myself with letting an Anglican authority introduce to your readers the Vicar in his new character. The Anglican historian Whittaker, a Rector of the Established Church, in his vindication of Mary, Queen of Scots, writes:

"Forgery—I blush for the honor of Protestants while I write it—seems to have been peculiar to the Reformed." Vol. 3, p. 2. Let us see how the Vicar illustrates, if he does not emulate, the little weakness of his pious theological ancestors.

Your readers will remember his tactics over my quotation from Prudentius, a writer of the Fourth Century, who uses *Ipsa* as I have fully set out in my "Résumé." He is not able to offer a tittle of evidence against it from any quarter; therefore, he *invents* an objection. He begins by exclaiming: "O the fraud, the villainy, the trickery of the Roman church!" Because "of her forgeries, we cannot trust a quotation she gives from ancient authors till we have thoroughly sifted the evidence in their favor." So he pronounces my quotation "spurious," but hastens to reassure us by saying, "I shall make a point of enquiring of my friends in England what critics think of the question." What! Is the "Oxford twain" reduced to this? Must "learned friends" come to the rescue on a matter so simple! Where is the Vicar's "critical apparatus"? Cannot his pet authorities—Littledale, Pusey, Janus or some of his oft-quoted dictionaries and cyclopædias—help him out? Alas! for the honor of his "dear *Alma Mater!*" Believe me, your readers will not hear from his "friends in England" or elsewhere a word in support of his cowardly statement before the "Greek Calends." It is simply the old trick of giving an inconvenient question the "three months hoist." Meanwhile let me assist the Vicar in his dilemma—he may send the information to his "friends."

The best editions of Prudentius' works are those of Weitzius, Heinsius, Cellarius, Elzevir and Chamillard. *Every one of these has the Hymn* which this pseudo-"priest" has the effrontery to declare "spurious." He thus proves himself admirably qualified for the *role* he has recently played. I mean to say that *with his own hand he has put into circulation and scattered broadcast one of the vilest, most scandalous and most palpable forgeries ever penned.* This he had published in an American magazine, now on my table, as the "speech" of a distinguished living Catholic Bishop at the Vatican Council. I ask the careful attention of your readers to what follows.

Among the Bishops at the Vatican Council who opposed the definition of Papal Infallibility on the ground of its *inopportuneness* was the illustrious Bishop Strossmayer of Bosnia, Austria. During the Council certain notorious and infamous letters from Rome were published in the *Augsburg Gazette*, a German newspaper. On the authority of Bishop Von Ketteler, Bishop Hefele (Germans), and Cardinal Manning, who were members of the Council, these teem with "perversions," "falsehoods" and the "most abject mendacity." They have been translated into English and published by a Protestant bookseller in a volume entitled—"Quirinus: Letters from Rome on the Council." It is recommended by Littledale in his "Plain Reasons" among "Books on the Roman Controversy"—birds of a feather flock together! Of course the Vicar has a copy of "Quirinus." It professes to give snatches from speeches which it attributes to Strossmayer, but with these I am not concerned. I am to deal with a *Tract* entitled "The Gospel in the Vatican," and called "the celebrated speech of Bishop Strossmayer in the Vatican Council," 80,000 copies and more of which were printed in English. This so-called "speech" is not mentioned at all in "Quirinus." It is, as your readers will directly see, a ridiculous, monstrous, and *apparent* forgery. Yet in November, 1884, the Vicar sent this *Tract*, with a letter for publication in the New York *Church Eclectic* (Ritualistic-ish) Magazine! We shall see how this *professing* stickler for literary honesty "sifted the evidence" of its genuineness before committing such an abominable crime, and circulating such a fiendish calumny on a Catholic Bishop who happened to be far away in Austria. I wonder how much better he would treat Bishop Kingdon if it served his turn!

Now here is the Vicar's letter as I copy it from the *Church Eclectic*, January, 1885, p. 928:

(For the Church Eclectic.)

BISHOP STROSSMAYER'S SPEECH IN THE VATICAN COUNCIL OF 1870.

Nov. 25th, 1884.

To the Editor of the Church Eclectic :

DEAR SIR,—Apropos of the Hopkins v. Capel business *would it not be advantageous to our church* to print the enclosed in your paper? Except in this form I have never met with the famous speech in full of Strossmayer at the Vatican. Several snatches from his speeches appear, as doubtless you know, in “Quirinus,” but not this one. *It is the finest thing I know of on the opposition side.*

Strossmayer, so the “letters from Rome” say, was the most eloquent Latin orator at the Council, and his speech produced a furor. True it is that after he returned to his diocese he, in common with the rest of the opposition, swallowed the new dogma at the point of an anathema, and I have been told, though I cannot vouch for the truth of the statement, *that he is now building a stately cathedral in reparation for his impertinent opposition to the wishes of Pius IX.* But if so that in no way overthrows his splendid arguments, but simply illustrates the horrible despotism of the Papacy.

I remain, yours very truly,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT.

The italics in this letter are mine. Comment would spoil its uniqueness. The “speech” is then printed at length, filling about *eleven pages* of the magazine. Of course I cannot copy it here. It is worthy only of a Littledale or a ritualistic Vicar. It is simply a *réchauffé* of all the threadbare sophisms, the hundredth-time refuted calumnies and the stale misrepresentations which have been the stock-in-trade of Protestantism since it has existed. The bishop is made to repudiate even St. Peter's Primacy, and to doubt that St. Peter ever was at Rome—facts admitted even by “Janus” and “Quirinus.” But that your readers may be able to form some judgment of the character of the ideas imputed to a Catholic bishop in the “speech,” I give the closing words :

“Ah ! if he who reigns above us wishes to punish us, make his hand fall heavy on us, as he did to Pharaoh, he has no need to permit Garibaldi's soldiers to drive us away from the Eternal City. He has only to let them make *Pius IX. a god, as we have made a*

goddess of the Blessed Virgin. (The italics are the Vicar's—they are not in the original tract.) Stop, stop, venerable brethren, on the odious and ridiculous incline on which you have placed yourselves: save the church from the shipwreck which threatens her, *asking from the Holy Scriptures alone for the rule of faith which we ought to believe and profess.*"

The italics are mine.

I remark on this "speech" as follows: Bishop Strossmayer is to-day, and has always been, one of the most illustrious Bishops in the church, and a few years ago was highly honored at Rome in being made by Leo XIII. an "Assistant at the Pontifical Throne." I have pronounced the speech a ridiculous forgery. How do I prove it? I am aware that it is as easy to close the eyes of the understanding as to close the eyes of the body. And yet I do not hesitate to say that, relying alone on the *intrinsic evidence* furnished by the "speech" itself, no intelligent Protestant, with any knowledge of Catholic principles, could for a moment be deceived by it. Years ago I submitted it to several Protestant legal friends, with no *extrinsic* evidence beyond the fact of Bishop Strossmayer's present position in the church, and they did not hesitate to declare their belief that it was a forgery. Can *any one* believe that a Catholic Bishop ever uttered the closing words—that the Holy Scriptures *alone* are the rule of faith in the Catholic Church? Why, even a Ritualist would anathematize such a heresy as that. Pusey and Littledale, with all their vagaries, certainly would.

But the *extrinsic* evidence leaves no doubt about the matter. The English translator of "Quirinus" exposes the fraud, and remember, the Vicar has this whole book in his possession, as his above letter admits. Again, the editor of the *Church Eclectic* in the "Home Summary" of the magazine, discusses the *Tract* sent him by the Vicar, and then adds: "Since writing the above we have been informed by another correspondent that the speech was *not* Strossmayer's, but was made up very ingeniously by a certain journalist (name not given) out of the 'leakages' of the council as they were reported about Rome." But the best evidence of all is Bishop Strossmayer's own denial and repudiation of the scandalous forgery. Fortunately he was

alive to answer his calumniators. He published his denial in the leading papers of all the capitals of Europe when the forgery was first put into circulation in 1872. This was copied into the English papers, and among them was the *London Tablet*. I had the Bishop's letter *thirteen years ago*, but lost it with my library in our great fire. Fortunately my loss is made good by Appleton's *Cyclopædia* (1876), which brands the calumny, like the mark of Cain, on the forehead of the criminal. The Vicar quoted from Appleton in his "Strictures." I quote from Vol. xv., p. 426: "*Strossmayer was represented as having delivered a violent opposition speech in one of the sessions, the text of which was reproduced by several journals; but in 1872 he addressed a letter to the *Francais* denying the authenticity of the speech and affirming that he 'never said one word during the entire council which could in any way diminish the authority of the Holy See, or tend to promote discord in the Church.'*" In 1875 he published a pastoral letter on the occasion of his 25th anniversary as a Bishop, declining a public manifestation in his honor 'while his fellow-countrymen of the Croats across the frontier are shedding their blood for liberty, and Christian charity makes it a duty to aid the widows and orphans of the fallen.'" In presence of these facts I do not trust myself to express my abhorrence of an impostor so utterly "gangrened" with malice. Sixteen years ago Bishop Strossmayer denied the calumny and published it to all the world. Three years ago the Vicar unearthed the corpse, re-baptized it with ritualistic "bell, book and candle" accompaniments and introduced it to readers who never before had heard of it. The editor of the *Eclectic* reminded him that it was *not* Strossmayer's, the translator of "Quirinus" exposes the fraud, and "Appleton" clinches the whole matter with the Bishop's own words. And yet no word of regret or apology has ever appeared from the Vicar to atone, if possible, for the heinous offence against the slandered Bishop. The calumny stands in letters of blood in the pages of the *Church Eclectic* and undimmed by a repentant tear. Bellarmine, he says, "deemed a flagrant lie a mere pious fraud, when the credit and position of the papacy were at stake," and

he consigns him to the "burning lake." The Vicar himself thinks it "advantageous to our church" to circulate a vile forgery, and expects to be *canonized*! Surely ingenuous minds in this community ought at once to be aroused to a suspicion of the true character of a man whose venomous tooth spares nor living nor dead.

P.S.—"CAUTION."—Such is the caption of the Vicar's latest effusion. It reminded me, at first blush, of a patent medicine advertisement. And it is worth about as much. It indicates feverishness, however. I wonder what sort of nerve-food does he use!

Short as is his letter it is full of impudent falsehoods, the result of deliberation or stupidity or both. His oft-time imbecility is fast flowering into downright wickedness. Patience with such a man can only stretch to snapping point. Now mark carefully. There are *three* Homilies on the Blessed Virgin *attributed* (let me say so as not to seem to beg the question) to St. Gregory Thaumaturgus. In the 3d last paragraph of my second last letter I give short selections from the *three*. I then say:

"It is my duty here to remind your readers that doubt has been cast on the *authorship* of these Homilies. Cardinal Bellarmine and Dupin doubted about them, but I must also add that the critics are ten to one against them (Bellarmine and Dupin) including the learned Protestant, Gerard Voss. For us the question is comparatively unimportant; for everything conspires to assign them an early date, and moreover I am not at present seeking to prove a doctrine by the weight of great names, but to discover the general mind of the early church respecting the Mother of God. And therefore whether these Homilies were preached by the illustrious Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, or by Saint Chrysostom, or by Macarius of Philadelphia, is comparatively of small importance."

These were my words touching *all three* Homilies, as your readers plainly see.

The quotation in my last letter closing the Third Century is taken from the second Homily. And yet the Vicar impudently and falsely says that I gave my quotation "without even a hint as to its character"—when I had just told all about

the Homilies fairly and fearlessly. Evidently he has read my letters backwards as he read the Fathers during his famous "six weeks'" incubation. What can an honest debater do with such a contemptible opponent?

But *is* there any doubt about the *authorship* of these Homilies? *Practically none.* Voss, the learned Protestant philologist, discovered them in a most ancient MS. of Grotto Ferrara, a convent of the Greek Benedictines near Rome; and, having collated them himself with other Codices in the Vatican and Sirletan Libraries, he published them with the other works of St. Gregory, Leo Allatius, Theophilus Raynaud, Honoratus à S. Maria, and Piazza assign them to St. Gregory. These are the great authorities on the matter. Bellarmine doubted the *authorship* only, but the Vicar would not "believe him on his oath," so he is dismissed. Piazza examined and utterly refuted Dupin's arguments, so that nothing is left to cause any doubt. Montfaucon says he found *one* of the homilies sometimes attributed to St. Gregory, sometimes to St. Chrysostom, sometimes to Macarius of Philadelphia. Either of the latter is as good as St. Gregory as to time and authority. *This is their whole critical history.* What difference does it make how an English Protestant translator classifies them? His translation, as an authority, derives all its value from the originals. It is worth neither more nor less. What does he know about them anyway except in so far as he learns from the critics and scholars whose names I have given above? Why, the very translation in *Clark* is from the text of Voss, the great editor of St. Gregory, who, as I have said, assigns them all to him. The Vicar evidently did not know anything about Voss. He says the church (what church, pray?) has for centuries been deceived by these "Dubious and Spurious" writings of St. Gregory, and that they are very copious! May God pity him! I now believe he would deny the genuineness of the Holy Scriptures themselves to get himself out of the miserable scrape his pitiable vanity led him into—his *itch* to "give information" and to "instruct Biblical students" on subjects of which he is as ignorant as a sucking dove. The copiousness he speaks of amounts to 74 pages! He is not quite satisfied with

"Clark's Ante-Nicene Library," and refers to Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*—learning made easy. Not bad for Oxford! Better go to "Comic Blackstone." But as he has told us "there are lawyers and lawyers," so also, I suppose, are there theologians *and* theologians! Great Heaven! I myself fearlessly raised the question of the authenticity of the Homilies, which I quote, of St. Gregory. I give the names of the greatest critics *pro* and *con*, with a result that leaves no reasonable doubt. But no reason or authority can pierce the coat of malice worn by this scrap-book theologian of Oxford. He says I gave no *hint* even of their character, he pronounces them "undoubtedly spurious," and like a veritable coward retires behind a *reference* to a *penny* "Dictionary of Christian Biography." *O seri studiorum!*

"Most of (my) citations are *equally* misleading," he says. Good! This is indeed a compliment in disguise. Thanks! Your readers will not forget Prudentius, Bishop Strossmayer, and St. Gregory Thaumaturgus.

If you will pardon my saying so, Mr. Editor, I think it a mercy to the Vicar to prohibit his hysterical interjections during my *Rejoinder*. It is hardly fair to tempt him between the upper and nether mill stone. Besides, he will have lots of time "before Lent sets in."

R. F. Q.

LETTER VIII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—In my last letter I put in blazing light the detestable character, mental and moral, of the Vicar as an anti-Catholic controversialist. Theretofore I had fully proved not only how *various* the reading of our text is, but also that it made no difference to Catholic doctrine on the Blessed Virgin whether we read in *Gen.* iii. 15—*Ipse, Ipsa, Ipsum, Ille, Illi, Hic, Haec,*

Hoc—all which are to be found in this place. To the second branch of this case I will devote, for the most part, what I have to say. I would gladly stop here because of other pressing duties, but I owe it to truth and to charity to make the religion I profess known as it really is in this particular, and to vindicate it, as well as I can, against the gross calumnies and misrepresentations of my opponents.

To premise: It is the unhappiness of my position now that I am compelled to join issue with the Vicar in detail rather than on principle. He has no religious principle. He is “neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor yet good red herring.” He is a sort of theological hermaphrodite and hybrid. For instance: He is licensed by the Bishop of his diocese; he lives and officiates within the limits of the St. John Anglican Deanery, and yet he has not hitherto dared, because he would not be allowed, to attend the meetings of the Deanery. He professes to belong to the Church of England. *He* is no Protestant—only a “true catholic,” you know! And yet he puts himself forward as the spokesman of Anglicanism. All right. Let me here only remind my “dissenting Protestant” friends that I am to deal with this Proteus just as his theological kaleidoscope presents him. They will the better be able to gauge the depth of his sympathy for them in their loss of “apostolic” Christianity and “the ministry and sacraments of the church.”

In his third letter the Vicar says: “It is an unheard of doctrine which asserts that Christ put forward His mother and helped her *as our champion* to overthrow the devil.” Precisely! But in the paragraph preceding he uttered a malicious calumny against the Catholic church by charging this monstrous doctrine to her; whereas if any such exists among persons claiming the Christian name, it cannot probably be found anywhere outside of such an ecclesiastical bedlam as Anglicanism. Pusey says: *Even Mohammedanism, as a great heresy, has retained more fragments of truth than much of this so-called modern Christianity of the Church of England.* The Catholic doctrine is that Jesus Christ by His Passion, Death, and glorious Resurrection is our *only* champion of Redemp-

tion from the devil—and all his aiders and abettors, no matter how loudly they may cry out, “Lord! Lord!”

Again he says: “That she has overcome Satan *as one of Christ’s redeemed* in the power of the Holy Ghost none ever doubted.” What is he prating about then? Over and over again I stated this to be the meaning of our reading of the words, “*Ipsa conteret caput tuum—She shall bruise thy head,*”—and I quoted from the Bull *Ineffabilis* that the Blessed Virgin crushed the serpent’s head “*by that virtue* with which she was endued from on high.” All the great Catholic theologians cited by me were to the same effect. Let me add here the authority of an old French Catholic Bible (1748), with the celebrated Calmet’s commentary, where the explanation is actually given in the text: “Je mettrai une inimitié éternelle entre toi et la femme, entre sa race et la tienne; *elle* te brisera la tête (*par le sauveur qui naîtra d’elle*) et tu tacheras de la mordre par le talon”—Translated:—“I will put an eternal enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and hers; *She* shall bruise thy head (*by the Saviour who will be born from her*), &c.”

Again he writes: “The modern Roman Church, it seems to me, in her efforts to exalt the Blessed Virgin has overlooked the fact so admirably expressed by St. Augustine, that ‘though the Virgin was Christ’s mother in the flesh, *She was born of Christ after the spirit*; forasmuch as all who have believed in Him, *among whom is herself also*, are rightly called the *children* of the Bridegroom.’” “The *modern* Roman Church” forsooth! Am I really talking to a blind man about colors? Why, St. Augustine’s words are simply a paraphrase of Mary’s own sublime outburst of inspiration: “My soul doth magnify the Lord and my spirit hath rejoiced in God, MY SAVIOUR.” The saint was a Bishop of this same “Roman Church” and no Anglo-ritualist I ween. He got his doctrine from her as he himself so well expresses it: “I should not believe the Gospels unless the authority of the church moved me thereto.” Let me commend to the Vicar’s meditation another passage from the great “Doctor of Grace” on Mary’s dignity as he conceived it:

"Except, therefore, the Holy Virgin Mary, about whom, *on account of the honor of the Lord*, I will not allow the question to be entertained when sins are under discussion; for how do we know what increase of grace was bestowed on her to enable her to overcome sin in every way, who merited to conceive and bring forth Him who, as is plain, had no sin; with the exception, therefore, of this Virgin, if we could gather together all those male and female saints, while they were living here below, and could ask them whether they were without sin—what answer do we think that they would give?"

Did St. Augustine think that any other "eminent female saint" could illustrate, so well as Mary, the triumph of God's grace in the crushing of the serpent?

Once more, the Vicar says: "To make the woman the champion of the race is to distort all Scripture." Yes, and to wickedly and scandalously and maliciously assert as he does over and over again that the Catholic Church does so is to run the risk of incurring the penalties pronounced in Scripture against "liars," "slanderers" and "calumniators"—a place in "the burning lake." So much have I felt bound to say in reply to the "champion" calumny. The Vicar writhes and wallows in its very slime to the end of his "strictures." Your readers can apply the answer where required.

He next flies off to Papal infallibility and the False Decretals. We are not discussing these subjects now. One thing at a time if it so please him. Those of your readers interested in the "False Decretals," so called, can satisfy themselves by studying what distinguished Protestant writers have said about them—Guizot, Ranke, Vogt and others. The silly slanders of "Janus" and Littledale they will find answered in "Anti-Janus," by Cardinal Hergenröther, and in Father Ryder's "Catholic Controversy," a reply to Littledale's "Plain Reasons," of which book I will speak later. Papal infallibility is a terrible bugbear to the Vicar, and naturally so—it interferes with his own self-assumed prerogative. However, that question is not now before the court. It is true that schisms of all kinds were prophesied to follow its definition by the Vatican Council. The great theological windbags of Germany and England have

had time to exhaust all the resources of their "scientific history," their "liberal theology," their "higher criticism" and their "deeper views"—to shoot their last brittle sophism against the Everlasting Rock, to spit at it their last envenomed lie; and yet from the summit to the base of that Rock there is neither chasm nor mark of chasm. Through all the Catholic Church there is Unity of Faith—unity perfect and undestructible—as has been ever, as shall be ever, all days even to the consummation of the world. Every day, from every clime, one glorious CREDO arises to the throne of God, harmonious as the chant sent forth from all creation, in the first exulting dawn of its being, "when the morning stars praised Me together, and all the sons of God made a joyful melody." Aye, there she goes, that tiny ship of Peter's, with a Leo at her helm:

Blow fair thou breeze! She anchors ere the dark.
 Already doubled is the cape—our bay
 Receives that prow which proudly spurns the spray.
 How gloriously her gallant course she goes!
 Her white wings flying—never from her foes—
 She walks the waters like a thing of life,
 And seems to dare the elements to strife.

A few other points in this letter I will notice later on.

FOURTH LETTER. There is absolutely nothing in this *ad rem*, beyond the veriest "balderdash" (his own term) and rubbish, that I have not already disposed of. I notice, however, that he recommends "every student of Church history" to get a copy of "Janus," while not a word is said about the learned reply to it entitled "Anti-Janus." Of course, the Vicar never read it because Littledale, to whom he is a mere bob-tail, does not mention it in his list of "Books on the Roman Controversy."

I cannot allow his slander on the memory of "the Saintly Père Gratry," as the Vicar so justly calls him, to pass unnoticed. He appears to have *three letters* written by Gratry to Bishop Deschamps at the time of the Vatican Council. Littledale has them "on his list." Doubtless they are the only writings of this great author and French academician the Vicar has ever read. He quotes from them *two sentences*, which as they stand are utterly meaningless; but they sound well and that is all he

requires. Now, in the whole history of literature, I know of no misapprehension by a learned man so inexplicable as that by Père Gratry, of the question he discussed. Ah! yes, but he was an honest man and publicly confessed his mistake and corrected his error. Here are his words in a letter to one of his fellow academicians after the definition of Papal Infallibility by the Vatican Council: "I do not wish to enter upon theological ground, but I would just observe that I have withstood the doctrine of *inspired infallibility*, and this the Council rejects. I have fought against the doctrine of *personal* infallibility—the Council decrees *official* infallibility. . . . I dreaded something like a *scientific*, political, or governing infallibility, but the Council decrees only that which is *doctrinal*. I do not mean to say that I am free of error in my polemical views. *I have made many mistakes in this, but, at least, I am ready to humble myself wherein I have erred.*" Translated from "Les derniers jours de Père Gratry, par Père Perraud" now a Bishop and member of the French Academy. But then you know Gratry "had to swallow the new dogma at the point of an Anathema"! I do not know that he built any "stately cathedral in reparation for his impertinent" letters. Perhaps the Vicar would inform us.

A very funny thing about a ritualistic "priest" is the way he patronizes revolt against church authority. To his mind it always implies, at all events, the presence of great *moral* and *intellectual* power. Gratry, for instance, is called "saintly" because of his three ephemeral letters, and Döllinger is a "learned church historian and theologian" because "it is supposed" he wrote Janus—a statement, by the way, for which the Vicar has not a particle of evidence beyond Littledale's assertion which *is not true*. Has Döllinger, I wonder, become a ritualist? From being a "papist" has he fallen *up* to the dignity of an—"apist."

FIFTH LETTER. This is the offspring of the famous "six weeks" incubation. It simply reeks with the *infamous calumny*, already repeatedly exposed, that Mary ever blessed, is the "Champion of the human race" according to Catholic teaching. As it is based on that and has no significance without it,

I might pass it by unnoticed, more especially, too, since it is foreign to the points at issue. But his iniquities are now so great that I cannot allow even a lack of logic to save him.

He quotes passages from the Fathers which assert that God alone is to be adored, that Christ is the One Mediator between God and man, and that all our trust is to be reposed in Him alone. This he says contradicts the "Roman doctrine" on the Blessed Virgin!

Now, I fear this argument proves too much for the Vicar, because it goes towards demonstrating that St. Liguori himself did not admit the Roman doctrine. And as I am most heartily willing to accept the strongest language he has quoted from the Fathers, or which they have ever used on the subject, it proves that *I* also reject the Roman doctrine. Yet, if this conclusion is false, how can the premises be true? Let us look at the argument.

Major premiss: "No one who says that all his hope is in Christ can admit the 'Roman doctrine' on the Blessed Virgin."

Minor premiss: "But the Fathers quoted by the Vicar say this." *Therefore* they do not admit the "Roman doctrine."

The Vicar has proved the minor premiss, which no Catholic ever dreamed of denying; when has he or any of the brood of Littledale & Co. condescended to prove the major, the very subject, be it observed, that he has introduced into this discussion? *Nowhere!*

I can, however, prove the truth of the contrary proposition, by referring to any of our devotional writers. I open at random the "Soliloquy of the Soul" by Thomas á Kempis. He says of our Lord:

"He it is who made and redeemed thee; who labored and strove and overcame for thee. He is thine Advocate, and the propitiation for thy sins. He is thy Comforter, thy Guide, and Guardian. He is thine only One, thy beloved One, 'who feedeth among the lilies' and who longeth to rest upon thy breasts. Whether thou art in sadness or in joy, ever have recourse unto Him; for He is the mirror of holy life, and the model of justice. He is the never-failing light of the soul, the lover of chastity, and the joy of the conscience. . . . To Him, above all, should every intention, every action, speech, reading, prayer, meditation, and speculation be directed.

Through Him salvation is given unto thee and life eternal is prepared for thee."

And again, a few pages farther on :

"For I know that my life and conversation is not such, as I may dare to put any trust in myself; but this is *my hope and my consolation, to place my trust and my rest in the price of Thy precious Blood, in which I place my whole repose.*"

Your Catholic readers will probably be astounded at the information the Vicar has put together as passages from the Fathers, containing the above doctrine as decisive proof against *us*. Why! we are bound by the Vatican Council to say anathema to whosoever will not receive this doctrine.

But I forget myself. The question is, whether Thomas á Kempis, after using the language just quoted, could honor the Blessed Virgin in the "Roman" fashion. I turn a few pages and find these words addressed to our Lady :

"Do thou, O most pious mother, vouchsafe to look upon my littleness, for thou canst assist me in many ways, and warm my heart with plentiful consolation amidst my afflictions. When, then, I am girt about with afflictions or temptations, I will presently without dread have recourse unto thee, because mercy is there more ready where greater grace abounds."

This, I suppose, the Vicar will allow to be "Roman doctrine." And if so, it is clear that persons holding the Roman doctrine may still use the language of the Fathers respecting our Divine Lord. But it may be supposed, rather he charges it against us, that we have left off using this language. Let him open a very common Prayer Book, the *Garden of the Soul*. He will find there that—

"We must believe that neither mercy, nor grace, nor salvation, either can or ever could, since Adam's fall, be obtained any otherwise than through the death and passion of the Son of God."

Or again, look at another common book amongst us, the *Manual of Devotion*. He will find that—

"The Church of God teaches us to put our whole confidence in the merits of Jesus Christ. He is our *only* Saviour, the *One Media-*

tor between God and man, as the apostle tells us. It is in His life-giving Blood *alone* that we can hope for mercy and grace and salvation."

But what about "St. Liguori" and "The *Raccolta*"? Well, in the Saint's address to the reader of "*The Glories of Mary*," he says: Our Divine Lord "offered and paid the superabundant ransom of His precious Blood, in which alone is our *salvation, life and resurrection*." The italics are the Saint's. Again, the *Raccolta* has: "O, most compassionate Jesus! Thou *alone* art our salvation, our life, and our resurrection."

But this elementary doctrine of Christianity is the underlying idea, the very quintessence of every prayer in both these *favorite* books of the Vicar's, whether addressed to the Blessed Virgin or to any other saint. The Vicar may not understand this; but then he ought not, for simple decency's sake, to say nothing of self-respect, call himself a "true Catholic." "Oh, Heavens," exclaims Carlyle, as he glances with a kind of repugnance at the newest sub-sect, "what shall we say of Puseyism (another name for Ritualism) in comparison to Twelfth-Century Catholicism? Little or nothing, for indeed it is a matter to strike one dumb."

Is it not, then, a wretched mockery, and does it not betray the most disgraceful ignorance of Catholic belief, to quote passages from the Fathers, not one whit stronger than those from St. Liguori and the *Raccolta* alone, and thence to argue the diversity of belief between the Ancient and "Modern Roman Church"?

LETTER IX.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—This is not the time to discuss the question at all fully, but is it true, as the Vicar asserts, that the Fathers knew nothing of the intercession and invocation of the Blessed Virgin? A

more contemptible falsehood was never penned! To the Fathers he has appealed, and to the Fathers he must go. "Antiquity" and "the Primitive Church" is the great hobby of Ritualists—at least so they say. Let us see what support they get in that quarter. The Vicar allows the Blessed Mary to be one of the Saints—"the Chief of Saints," in his own words. Was this a slip of the pen? I say that the Fathers certainly believed in the intercession and invocation of the Saints, and I will prove it by Protestant authorities alone. Here I must compress. Daillé, whose knowledge of the Fathers was not the result of "six weeks'" study of "copious indices," declares that St. Gregory Nazianzen was infected with the superstitions of his day on that subject. Le Clerc says the same thing, and is fully satisfied with the absurdity of those Protestants who claim the Nicene Fathers as being on their side. Lardner will tell the Vicar the same thing. Isaac Taylor, like a rational Protestant, has written an elaborate work to show that the Nicene Church was even more corrupt than the present "Roman Church." Middleton looks upon the Church of the Fourth Century as in a state of modified paganism, because of the same superstitious practices. Take again the historians. Milner seems to date "popery" at least from the time of St. Cyprian. Mosheim speaks of the corruptions in the same direction, which a superstitious zeal had introduced into the church. Spanheim has a whole chapter on the subject. So has Gibbon. Waddington is to the same effect. All these writers side with the heretic Vigilantius in his attack on the doctrine of the church. But perhaps these authorities are too Protestant for the Vicar. Let him consult Pusey, Keble, and Cardinal Newman before his reversion. They will tell him (Library of the Fathers, vol. ix., p. 135, note) that the invocation of the saints was common in the fourth century. Perhaps again these gentlemen are too "Roman" for him. Be it so. Maybe Mr. Palmer, of Worcester College, Oxford, will suit him. Well, in his "fifth letter to Cardinal Wiseman," Palmer reluctantly acknowledges the fact that the saints were invoked in the fourth century, and he allows, without the slightest hesitation, that their intercessory power was always acknowl-

edged by the Fathers of the Church. A ritualist "priest," however, likes a Bishop as an authority on such matters—not, of course, an "Episcopal Dunce," like him of Liverpool. Bishop Newton was a celebrity in his day, and his "Dissertations on the Prophecies" is one of his monuments. I will quote from the 23d Dissertation :

"Read only some of the most celebrated Fathers; read the orations of Basil on the Martyr Mamas, and on the Forty Martyrs; read the oration of Ephrem Syrus on the death of Basil, and on the Forty Martyrs, and on the praises of the holy martyrs; read the orations of Gregory Nazianzen on Athanasius, and on Basil, and on Cyprian; read the orations of Gregory Nyssen on Ephrem Syrus, and on the martyr Theodorus, and on Meletius, Bishop of Antioch; read the sixty-sixth and other homilies of Chrysostom; read his orations on the martyrs of Egypt, and other orations, and you will be greatly astonished to find how full they are of this sort of superstition, what powers and miracles are ascribed to the Saints, what prayers and praises are offered up to them. . . . And who are the great patrons and advocates of the same worship now? ARE NOT THEIR LEGITIMATE SUCCESSORS AND DEFENDANTS, THE MONKS, AND PRIESTS, AND BISHOPS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME?"

Correct you are, Bishop Newton! What more can be desired? The Vicar will admit that if any Saint may be lawfully invoked, the Blessed Virgin—"the Chief of Saints" may be. How preposterously ridiculous, then, and absurd it is for such as he to write and speak on this subject as if the honor paid by the Catholic Church to our Blessed Lady differed at all *in kind* from that paid to other saints. That they differ *in degree* I delight to proclaim, and God forbid that any professing Christian, who knows what he is talking about, should hesitate to acknowledge her unspeakable privileges, or allow that any one whose faith respecting the Incarnation was sound, could possibly go too far in venerating her who is "blessed among women." But we have no special doctrine respecting the veneration due to her. She is to be honored, because all saints are to be honored, and for no other reason. She is to be honored more than other saints, because certain facts are re-

vealed to us respecting her, both in Holy Scripture and by Tradition, from which we know that God would have us especially to honor her whom He has chosen to honor above all other saints. So much *en passant* on this topic.

Having closed his quotations from the Fathers, the Vicar says: "I am credibly informed that no instance is to be found in an ecclesiastical writer of even the corrupt reading *Ipsa* being interpreted of the Blessed Virgin till S. Bernard's time (12th cent.)." O! O! Save me from such "learned friends"! Alas! renowned Oxford! Verily you have fallen into the hands of thieves in this diocese of Fredericton and been despoiled of your fair fame! I beg your readers to remember that the above statement is made by a man who said that I ought to be "more modest,"—that I was "ignorant or disingenuous,"—that I wanted "knowledge or understanding,"—and that it was necessary for him to stand at my elbow, as a tutor, to instruct me how to read my own authorities. Whew! The "learned friend" who so "credibly informed" the Vicar must have had perfect confidence in the unlimited voracity of his shark for anti-Catholic garbage. By and by I will administer a counter-irritant, in the shape of quotations from ecclesiastical writers many hundred years before St. Bernard.

Again he says: "I cannot find the slightest hint for the modern Roman interpretation of Gen. iii. 15." And yet every Father he quoted gave simply the "Roman interpretation," viz., that Jesus Christ, our "all in all" in life and in death, crushed the serpent's head as our only Redeemer and Saviour and by the prowess of His own Divine and Almighty power,—while the Blessed Mary His Mother crushed it by the Grace and Merits of that same Saviour whom she herself in the *Magnificat* calls—"God, MY SAVIOUR" even before He was born. By the same Grace and Merits "all faithful Christians" triumph over Satan, as St. Paul beautifully says: "May the God of Peace crush Satan speedily under your feet," Rom. xvi. 20. Of course the Fathers knew nothing of the doctrine which he calumniously attributes to the Catholic church. There is no escape for the unfortunate Vicar here. "Minimizing!" he will exclaim in the agony of his shame. Bah!

As soon could the hand of man tear from the vault of heaven a star which Almighty power had hung there, as pluck from its place a single truth which the Spirit of God has set to shine forever in the Church's everlasting creed.

The truth of Scripture, as St. Jerome well says, is not in the words, but in the sense—"nec putemus *in verbis* Scripturarum esse Evangelium, sed *in sensu*." To whom will my Protestant friends apply for the "Roman interpretation"? To Catholics themselves or to a conceitedly bloated mushroom growth of yesterday—a ritualistic Vicar? I need not pause for a reply. But for their benefit I will here introduce a witness whose authority is simply supreme. Hugo Grotius, who lived 1583–1645, was one of the most learned of Protestants and certainly a choice specimen of wisdom and virtue. He was, too, a bosom friend of the celebrated Jesuit Petau (Petavius). In his commentary on Genesis iii. 15, speaking of *Ipsa*, Grotius says—(I translate):¹

"The Vulgate has *Ipsa*, as if it were spoken of the woman, but in a sense not improper."

Now Grotius had no difficulty in seeing that the sense was the same to his Protestant intellect as to that of his Catholic friend whether *Ipse*, *Ipsa*, or *Ipsum* was used. And that sense, as I have so often pointed out, is that the whole victory over the serpent is to be referred to Christ, who "blotted out the handwriting of the decree which was against us . . . fastening it to the Cross . . . triumphing openly . . . in Himself." Coloss. ii. 14–15. Of course, it were too much to expect every theological upstart of the calibre of this ritualistic-sacerdotal wight to be a Grotius. Yes, indeed, but we have at least the right to demand more modesty in the use of those phrases with which your readers are familiar in the prophetic writings. From the "occipital region" of the Vicar's brain a sign has, for some time, been hanging out in large type—"The word of the Lord came to me saying;" or "The burden of the word of the Lord to the Catholic Church, her Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, Theologians, and Biblical scholars by the hand of the

¹ "Vulgatus habet, *Ipsa*, quasi de muliere ageretur, sensu non male."

Vicar—the ‘Priest of the Mission Chapel.’” Let him call in that sign and many of his follies and impertinences may be forgotten.

But the hugest joke in the whole series of “Strictures” is his appeal to the “Vincentian Canon,” “the criterion of Catholicity,” viz.—“that which hath been believed everywhere, at all times, by all men.” Even here he is at his old trick of copying second, perhaps third—or fourth-hand. It is evident he knows nothing about the work of St. Vincent of Lerins from which he professes to quote. There is no such work of St. Vincent’s as that given by the Vicar—“adv. *Haereses*.” The work in which the celebrated Canon occurs is the “*Commonitorium (or Peregrinus) adversus Haereticos*.” A full translation of the Canon is as follows: “In the Catholic Church herself very great care is to be taken that we hold that which has been believed everywhere, always and by all men.” The remainder of the chapter from which this is taken must be veritable “gail and wormwood” to an Anglo-ritualist. Think of the Vicar quoting this against me! Ha! Ha!! Ha!!! O ’tis too good! He belongs to a school of thought (?) or sentiment about eighteen years old—a sort of aftermath of the Tractarian Movement led by Newman, Pusey, and Keble. How many of his peculiar religious tenets were taught and practiced among Anglicans here before his advent three or four years ago? Why is he now tabooed, shunned, and ostracized as a theological leper by his brethren, lay and clerical, in the Church of England, who charge against him that he has “gone in the way of Cain . . . and perished in the contradiction of Core,” and has moreover incurred all the terrible penalties pronounced by St. Paul against schism and schismatics? How does he reconcile this with the Apostle’s entreaty: “But I beseech you, brethren, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you, but be you perfect, in the same mind, and in the same judgment.” What is the matter? And yet he has the “cheek” to claim the attributes of “Universality, Antiquity, and Consent”—the Vincentian Canon—for Anglicanism or Ritualism: which? while he brands the teaching of the Catholic Church with “Idola-

try," "Apostacy," "Infidelity," "Impiety," "Blasphemy," and "Novelty." It is too appalling to be funny, still

Spectatum admissi risum teneatis amici?

A few reflections anent the Vincentian Canon, in its *affirmative sense* one of the touchstones of Catholic doctrine. There is now in session at Lambeth, England, a Pan-Anglican Synod. It will, doubtless, discuss questions touching the very foundations of Christian belief and doctrines that are dear to every Christian heart because they affect the whole Christian life. Should the deliberations result in any conclusions these may be embodied in decrees or furnish the material for some "Public Worship Act" like that of 1876, passed on purpose to put down Ritualism. Now, by what will these decrees be ruled? By the "Vincentian Canon"? O, no, but purely and simply by Acts of Parliament passed by Henry VIII., Elizabeth, and that "young tiger-cub, Edward VI.," as Littledale calls him. These are the cornerstones of the "National establishment," and no stream can rise higher than its source. What has the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided and what will they decide? This is the crucible in which the results of the labors of this Pan-Anglican Synod must be tried. They will not be worth the paper that will record them if they cannot stand this test. How is this? Let me state a few historico-legal propositions.

The Royal Supremacy in Spirituals was created by the Statute 25 Henry VIII., C. 19, and, re-enacted by 1 Elizabeth, is still law. What was the object of its creation and its effect? I quote from "Brooke's Privy Council Judgments" and "Fremantle's Judgments." In Fremantle, p. 110, Lord Chief Justice Campbell says: "In the . . . year 1534 Henry finding that there was no chance of succeeding with his divorce suit with the sanction of the Pope, and being impatient to marry Ann Boleyn, resolved to break with Rome altogether, and preserving all the tenets of the Roman Catholic faith, to vest in himself the jurisdiction which the Pope had hitherto exercised in England." He proceeds to say that this seizure of the Papal jurisdiction was effected by the Statute 25 Henry VIII., C. 19,

by which it was enacted that "for lack of justice at or in any of the courts of the Archbishops," "it shall be lawful to the parties grieved to appeal to the King's Majesty in the King's Court of Chancery, where delegates are to be appointed under the Great Seal, who are to adjudicate upon the appeal. This appeal is given in all causes in the courts of the Archbishops of this realm, as well in the causes of a purely spiritual nature which might hitherto have been carried to Rome, as in the classes of causes of a temporal nature, enumerated in statute 24, Henry VIII., C. 12." Now Lord Campbell does not mince matters in assigning motives to Henry which induced him to break what had been the fundamental law and invariable practice of his realm since it had been a Christian country. It was to gain the adulterous and incestuous possession of the wretched object of his lust, whom he was presently to sacrifice by a bloody death to his jealousy. What was Esau's selling his birthright for a mess of pottage to this infamy on the part of a Christian king?

The effect of this statute was not only to transfer to the king an authority hitherto exercised by the Pope, but by the same stroke it degraded the Bishops and Archbishops of the King's realm from the place they had hitherto occupied, as feeding each one his portion of the flock of Christ, over which the Holy Ghost, by the hand of Peter, had made them Bishops, to the condition of mere officers of the King, discharging a spiritual obligation under him, which they received from him, just as all the civil officers of his kingdom received their civil jurisdiction from him—an *infinite degradation* which lies upon the Anglican Episcopate assembled to-day in Synod at Lambeth; *infinite* because it changes the mission of the Holy Ghost for the exercise of divine endowments, into the mission of a civil ruler, incapable of communicating it. I here prescind altogether from the question of the validity of Anglican Orders. I speak of what the effect would be if these orders were valid, as in the Russian church.

Again: This Statute 25, Henry VIII., enacted not only what was contrary to all Christian practice, and to all Christian history, up to that time, in all the countries wherein the Christian

religion had been planted; but it enacted what is contrary to reason, inasmuch as it confounded the Divine kingdom, and the functions carried on in it by a Divine gift proceeding from the Person of our Divine Lord, with the functions of the human kingdom, which is the outcome of the natural society of man. God, indeed, stood at the head and origin of this natural society of man, and authorized the powers that be, as proceeding, mediately, from Him; but He had distinguished from it the Spiritual kingdom of His Son, and up to that time all Christian nations had recognized the distinction. Henry VIII. began this fundamental confusion of the Divine with the human kingdom; because the seizure of jurisdiction is the seizure of the Supreme power, on which rests the exercise, though not the essence, of all authority. See Allies—"Per Crucem ad Lucem."

What becomes of the Vincentian Canon,—“the criterion of Catholicity” to use the Vicar’s own words? Alas! It will find no echo in the Pan-Anglican Synod. It has no use for it. It can define no doctrine, it can teach nothing having the slightest binding obligation on the conscience of the most humble member of the church it claims to represent. The Privy Council is its master. Over fifty years ago it took the place of the Court of Delegates, originally appointed under the Royal Supremacy, as enacted by the Statute 25, Henry VIII. In this Court the Queen decides personally. During the last thirty-eight years, from the Gorham case (1850) to the present time, it has had to deal with questions which embrace the whole range of Christian belief and Christian life. Thus in the judgment in *Heath vs. Burder*, in 1862, it had to deal with our Lord’s Atonement, with Justification, and the Forgiveness and Remission of sins. In the case of *Williams vs. The Bishop of Salisbury*, and *Wilson vs. Fendale*, it had to deal with the Inspiration of Scripture, the doctrine of Eternal Rewards and Punishments, the belief in Prophecy, and many of the most intricate questions of theology. In the Gorham cases it decided that it was open to an Anglican minister to hold and teach Baptismal Regeneration, but not punishable in an Anglican minister to deny it. In the cases of *Liddell vs. Westerton* and *Liddell vs. Beal*, it laid down that in the Church of England

there was "no longer an altar of sacrifice, but merely a table at which the communicants were to partake of the Lord's Supper; that the term altar is never used to describe it, and there is an express declaration at the close of the Service against the doctrine of transubstantiation, with which the ideas of an altar and sacrifice are closely connected."

But a word more on this topic. As in times past in other places Anglican Bishops and writers have charged all sorts of corruptions in morals, in discipline and doctrine to the Catholic Church, so to-day the halls at Lambeth will ring out the old changes. Perhaps too the tremendous importance of *Ipsa* will be learnedly dwelt upon. Not Anglican right but Roman wrong will be the burden of their speech. This is the every day defence of the Church of England. But how can Roman sins justify the position taken up by her on the Royal Supremacy? What this Pan-Anglican Synod ought to set itself to prove is that this Royal Supremacy in Spirituals is compatible, either with historic facts before the time of Henry, or with the Christian faith in itself, or with reason, as the general guide of human things; that our Saviour has made promises to be with it and with the Bishops who are created by it; that He has promised in general to be with Bishops who allege that they make a portion of the church, though not in communion with the rest of it, even as they themselves conceive it, and who besides receive their spiritual jurisdiction from a King or a Queen. Would the Vicar just fresh from the Fathers give us the names of a few who point out the grounds on which controversies of the Faith are to be decided by Queens? And it might assist the Synod in proving their case if he would forward his own "true Catholic" views of the "Vincentian Canon" especially in its *exclusive sense*. See Allies on "The Royal Supremacy."

LETTER X.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—I continue my observations on the Vicar's fifth letter. Near its close he says: "Of course it would be simply impossible for any one to show that falsifications and forgeries were palmed off upon Christendom for the mere sake of supporting the corrupt reading of Genesis iii. 15." Yes, indeed; "simply impossible" and therefore not shown. And yet the cry of "falsifications and forgeries" has been his paint, battle-axe and war-whoop ever since he had the infelicity to champion Bishop Kingdon's scholarship. What a humiliating confession! What an ignominious "biting of the dust"! But he comes to time again. I must here protest that this "killing of the dead over again" has become as dull to myself as I fear it is otiose to your readers. I have to ask their earnest attention, however, to what immediately follows. It certainly points a moral on the disreputable ignorance and inconsistency, want of logic and disgusting pretentiousness of the Vicar which he has not, perhaps, hitherto equalled. Here is the paragraph on which I comment:

"About the 10th or 11th century a forgery in the shape of a panegyric on the Virgin was issued by an unknown author under the name of Methodius (312 A.D.). It is full of extravagant expressions and adulations, together with direct invocation and worship of the Virgin. It has deceived people up to the present day—has been translated in Clarke's Ante-Nicene Library as genuine, and quoted as genuine in Blunt's Theological Dict. under the head of 'Mary.' It is now condemned both by English and Roman theologians as spurious and not only spurious in the sense of being attributed by mistake to Methodius, but as a *forgery*, because the writer claims at the outset to be the writer of the Symposium on Chastity which is Methodius'."

Here is emphatic testimony, supplied by himself, to the

stupefying prejudice of the Vicar,—to the utter worthlessness of his knowledge on the matters he so *gallantly* undertook to handle, and to the atrocious recklessness of the manner in which he has done his work. His mind, fed so long on the uncouth Shibboleths of “Pope” Littledale’s “Books on the Roman Controversy,” seems a weltering chaos in respect of divine things connected with the Catholic religion. One would have thought that “six weeks” spent in an incubator constructed of “copious indices” of the Catholic Fathers, with a *yard stick* close by to test the progress of the evolving chick, must tend to clarify the theological conceptions of any mind. So to think must be an error. But who is sufficient to heal a mind so distempered? *Exoriare aliquis ex ossibus*—? O well, let him consult the “Eirenicon,” “Plain Reasons” or Tyler’s “Worship of the Virgin”—the mind grows by what it feeds on, and the appetite comes by eating, as the French proverb says. Meanwhile let me put your readers in touch with the Vicar as he manifests himself in the above quotation from his letter.

St. Methodius was an illustrious Father of the Church and Bishop of Tyre. He was martyred in the last general persecution about 312. His works were famous among the ancients. Among them is one entitled—“The Banquet of the ten Virgins or a Symposium on Chastity.” It is an eulogium of the state and virtue of Virginité. A discourse is put into the mouth of each of these virgins in commendation of this virtue. The holy Bishop thus teaches that Christ, the Prince of Virgins, coming from heaven to teach men the perfection of virtue, planted among them the state of virginité, to which a particular degree of glory is due in heaven—(Apoc. XIV. 4), and he calls it “the greatest gift of God to man, and the most noble and most beautiful offering that can be made by man to God, the most excellent of all vows.” Such is a summary of this book so celebrated in the Catholic Church. Milton embalms its spirit in his beautiful lines:

So dear to Heaven is saintly Chastity,
That, when a soul is found sincerely so,
A thousand liveried angels lacky her,
Driving far off each thing of sin and guilt.

About its authorship there is not now, nor has there ever been, the shadow of a shade of doubt. Indeed the unanimity of critics on the genuineness of *all* the writings attributed to Methodius which have reached us is well-nigh marvellous; more especially when we know that *somebody* is always to be found who, after "six weeks" among "copious indices," is ready to better the attempt of the philosophers of Laputa to extract sunbeams from cucumbers. For instance, the *only* work considered doubtful by recent critics is his treatise "*On Free Will*," but the Rev. William R. Clark of Oxford, who translates it for Clarke's Ante-Nicene Library, says: "The internal evidence must be said to confirm the ancient testimonies which assign it to Methodius." This is the language of the "Introduction." Now this "Library" (Vol. XIV.) contains all his writings and they are all declared to be genuine. I wish to draw the attention of your readers to the "*Oration concerning Simeon and Anna on the day they met in the Temple*," which well deserves the careful and thoughtful consideration of all students, theologically inclined, Anglican as well as Catholic. This oration the Vicar in his grandiose way pronounces a "*forgery*." He merely echoes the words of one Tyler, a "Bachelor of Divinity," (save the mark!) who about fifty years ago issued the first editions of two books filled with quotations from the Fathers, merely asserting that Christ is the one mediator between God and man—a doctrine, as I have shown, no less earnestly taught by Catholic theologians and spiritual writers than by the Fathers. These books are among the "copious indices" in which the Vicar travailed in compiling his "little thesaurus of argument for the public against the sophistries and vain boastings of Romanist controversialists." Did he have any idea *how* "little" it would be? I trust his "public" will consider he has kept his promise. But I will return to Tyler's books later.

Why does the Vicar catch up and repeat Tyler's words, that the "Oration" is a "forgery"? Purely and *only* because it is "full of extravagant expressions and adulations, together with direct invocations of the Virgin." O those "impious" invocations! They act upon him like a scarlet cloth in a Spanish bull-fight. Has he any knowledge beyond this on which he

could base his claim? Not a particle. Has he given your readers any authority for his statement that the "Oration" "is now condemned both by English and Roman theologians as spurious and a forgery"? None. But that makes no difference, because his faculty of smell in detecting a "Roman" forgery is never at fault except when it is an anti-Roman forgery and "advantageous to our church," as in Bishop Strossmayer's case. Then he "barks up the wrong tree," but only by accident. He does not mean to adopt the horrid principle that "the end justifies the means." O no—that were too "jesuitical."

Now I will prove for your readers that the "Oration" in question is neither "spurious" nor a "forgery," but a genuine work of St. Methodius. And first, there is a strong antecedent probability arising from the fact alone that he wrote the "Banquet of the ten Virgins" or Symposism on Virginité. The Blessed Virgin—the Virgin par excellence—was the first woman who consecrated herself to Christ in that state. A mind and heart, therefore, properly balanced in presence of divine things would be quite prepared to hear "very excellent things spoken of her by divines of all ages," as the Vicar himself admits. Of whom, then, would St. Methodius more naturally and fittingly use these "expressions and adulations," impiously declared by the Vicar to be "extravagant"? But I do not care to deal in probabilities on such a matter. We all know that some persons have so very characteristic a manner of writing that any practiced reader can at once pronounce the authorship of their disputed works. There is, for instance, *no* mistaking Macaulay's, Carlyle's or Cardinal Newman's compositions. And the same thing is observable in many of the Fathers. Now, the great critics say that no writers have styles more characteristic of their authors than the works of St. Methodius have of himself. His language (Greek), they say, is elaborately ornate. The most flowery metaphors meet us at every turn. See even the translation in Clarke's "Library"—it is loaded with epithets. He expresses, says Du Pin, a few thoughts in many words. His interpretations of Scripture are almost always mystical. His writings show him to have been well

read in the heathen Classics, to have warmly admired their beauties, but to have held their objects in abhorrence. His treatise on "Free-will" displays an accurate acquaintance with Philosophical matters. But his most striking peculiarity is his violent antipathy to the errors commonly attributed to Origen. Now, *every one* of these characteristics of St. Methodius' confessedly genuine writings is to be found in the "Oration" which the Vicar, without any knowledge of it himself but simply as playing *parrot* to Tyler, calls a "forgery." What has become of "the critical apparatus" which early in this discussion he led us to believe he carried around in his breeches' pocket?

Who are the critics and what do they say about this "Oration"? I will select but a few, and they are the most severe. Leo Allatius (1679) is called the last theologian and writer who kept guard over the honor of the letters of Greece—"dicitur ultimus theologus atque scriptor qui Græciæ literarium servaverit honorem." *Natali's Enchirid*, p. 115. He was not only a most learned and judicious critic but he gave to this particular "Oration" the most careful and accurate study. In his work—"Diatriba de Methodii scriptis, p. 341—Disquisition on the writings of St. Methodius," he declares that "*Non ovum ita simile est ovo neque aqua aquae, ut istius phrasis et elocutio, et reliqua dicendi lumina, Symposii formulis similia sunt* : Egg is not more like egg, nor water like water than the phrasing and style and other ornaments of speech of this (Oration) are like their patterns in the symposium" (on Chastity). He leaves no doubt about it on an honest, unprejudiced mind. But as the Vicar is of a sceptical turn, and probably has confined his attention so closely to the second-hand rubbish of Tyler *et hoc omne genus*, that he never heard of Allatius, I will refer him to the "Eirenicon"—his "perfect store-house of accurate information." When writing that work Pusey was on the *qui vive* for authorities from every quarter against the honor paid to Mary in the Catholic Church. He, too, sought the assistance of "learned friends" and to scavenge the Greek Liturgies. Here are his words: "My own studies not having lain in the Greek Liturgies, I consulted my friend the Rev. G. Williams, King's College, Cambridge, and

append some observations which he addresses to me." Williams writes to Pusey as follows: "It cannot, I think, be denied that the Orthodox Greek Church does 'even surpass the Church of Rome' in their exaltation of the Blessed Virgin in their devotions; and all I can say is, that on this point the Orientals, generally 'so jealous of antiquity,' have innovated on the practice of earlier and, what we hold, to be purer times. This, we shall presently find, is *mere matter of history*." Yes, "mere matter of history," as I have already shown in my quotations from the Greek Fathers of the first six centuries. Very creditable to Cambridge is this straightforward confession. But this is not the point now. What does Cambridge say about Leo Allatius as an authority? The testimony is very satisfactory. Williams tells Pusey that "we cannot have a more competent witness than Leo Allatius" on the Greek Office Books. Who support the judgment of Leo on St. Methodius' Oration? Natalis Alexander, a host in himself; Du Pin, the most cautious and sceptical of critics; Fabricius, the most severe and judicious of critics, and Gallandus, a hyper-critic. In addition to these we have the authority of the translators in Clarke's Ante-Nicene Library (1869) and Blunt's Theological Dictionary. The latter is a favorite book of the Vicar's, and I have a right to use it against him, more especially since it is scarcely possible to turn over ten pages of it without meeting with some more or less open attack on the Catholic Church. Again, what will your readers say to his treatment of Clarke's "Library"? Shortly ago I quoted from a Homily of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus. Thereupon he rushed frantically into your columns with a "Caution" and declared it "spurious," appealing to the fact that Clarke's "Library" classified it with "spurious or doubtful" writings of St. Gregory. I disposed of the "Caution" very summarily. But now when the same "Library" declares the "Oration" of St. Methodius to be genuine the Vicar screams out—deceit! Consistent, indeed!

Here I might leave this "Oration," but I am anxious that your readers should know a good deal more about it than the Vicar appears to know. Notwithstanding what the critics quoted above say, there is a difficulty, perhaps worth mention-

ing, connected with it. I refer to the fact that in one or two passages it speaks of the Holy Trinity as if the Nicene doctrine on that subject had been fully developed in the time of St. Methodius, which was not the case. I leave the Vicar to ponder the "Oration" and find the passages. But it is ridiculous in the extreme for people like Tyler and the Vicar (if he know anything at all about it) to make this a difficulty, for they disavow the principle upon which it is built. If they once concede that the Church has a right to alter its language on subjects which heresy, if nothing else, has rendered most important, they must not blame the Catholic Church for applying to the Blessed Virgin a principle which they allow in other cases. This difficulty led several writers to doubt its genuineness, but by a consensus of all the great critics, assuming their interpretation is correct, these technical expressions are interpolations. They say that the "Oration" is so clearly the work of St. Methodius that they would as soon think of rejecting a book of Holy Scripture in consequence of one or two existing interpolations. For instance: The Vicar rejoices over the fact that what he calls the "celebrated interpolation in 1 John, v. 7," is now omitted in the Revised Version. Again: The Revisors have omitted from the Lord's Prayer in St. Matthew the words—"For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen." Is this a valid reason for rejecting the Gospel of St. Matthew or St. John's Epistles? ¹

¹ The evidence above submitted in support of the authenticity of the "Oration" of St. Methodius so demoralized the Vicar, that he did not dare to say a word in reply. He put his "priestly vow" in his breeches' pocket with his "yard stick" and "critical apparatus," and went his way—to consult his "learned friends" in England. This cowardly shirking of a question, which he himself had raised, is one of many striking proofs of his imbecility, and is, besides, a stentorian confession that he believes that no moral or mental responsibility whatever attaches to his words. I need say no more now on St. Methodius. I will but refer the learned reader to Bishop Fessler's classic work, *Institutiones Patrologiæ—Institutes of Patrology*, a new edition of which, by the illustrious Professor Jungmann, of Louvain University, I have just received fresh from the press, for an estimate of Methodius and his writings.

I have devoted thus much space to St. Methodius that your readers may thoroughly know the *methods* of the Vicar—the man who has prated so much about “verification,” “suppression,” and the “critical apparatus”—the man who is so devoid of all sense of shame and intellectual self-respect as to swallow, apparently without a grimace, any authority, which, when retailed by him, may assist in defaming the church of Jesus Christ, and in “minimizing” the honor to be paid to the woman who stood by His side from the cradle to the grave. I have not space for any sort of vindication of those other writings which, on the mere *ipse dixit* of Tyler, the Vicar rejects, nor is it necessary. He refers your readers to Tyler’s “Worship of the Virgin” for a full list of the “palmed off” sermons on the Blessed Virgin.

I would poorly perform the task I have set myself in this *Rejoinder* did I allow the name of this wretchedly ignorant author and his miserable book to pass, without giving your readers an idea of the pabulum on which the Vicar supports his lean and hungry creed. Tyler’s book has upwards of four hundred octavo pages and sells for *ten and sixpence*. This is all I can say in its favor. It displays an intense ignorance of some of the commonest particulars in ecclesiastical history. The author shows himself unacquainted with the first principles of historical or bibliographical criticism. And the violation of every established law of ordinary reasoning which occurs at every page would but further disgrace the Vicar were that possible.

Now it is very easy for persons like Tyler and the Vicar to be sceptical in the extreme, when the Blessed Virgin is concerned. But, if they know what they are talking about, would they like to stand to their principles (so-called) when the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is at stake? Yet, I fearlessly maintain, in the face of all the Theological science the diocese of Fredericton can muster, that the historical grounds upon which the Vicar and his “pals” reject the veneration of the Blessed Mary, as practised in the Catholic church, may logically be turned against the adoration of our Divine Lord and Saviour. The possibility of such a thing probably never crossed their minds. I therefore would beg them, and all who agree with

them, seriously to consider the matter, and see whether they can well afford to use *negative* arguments against doctrines which have once received the sanction of Christendom.

Let me, on so important a matter, exemplify my meaning, and instruct the Vicar, by shortly running through the reasonings (?) of Tyler's first chapter of patristic testimony, which is a review of the evidence respecting the Blessed Mary, taken from the ancient creeds and Apostolic Fathers.

Section 2. "The ancient creeds," says Tyler, "contain no allusion to any worship paid to the Blessed Virgin, whereas the creed of Pius IV. does. Therefore, the Church of Rome has added to the primitive faith."

My Answer. The *earlier* creeds contain no allusion whatever to any worship paid to the Son or to the Holy Ghost. Has the church then added to the primitive faith by saying of the Holy Ghost—"who with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified?" I thought it had been fully settled, that "to add to the *Confession* of the Church, is not to add to the faith." The wording here is mine, and presents Tyler's argument in a more logical shape than his own book does.

Section 3. "St. Clement of Rome never invokes the Blessed Virgin, neither does St. Barnabas; nor does St. Hermas, St. Ignatius, or St. Polycarp," says Tyler. "Therefore, the Romish doctrine was unknown in those days."

My Answer. Tyler being dead yet speaks by the Vicar. Will the Vicar be kind enough, notwithstanding my discourteous use of the "Shillalah," to show me a *single* invocation of CHRIST throughout the writings of St. Clement, St. Barnabas, St. Hermas, or St. Polycarp? Does he believe that their silence on *this* point is conclusive or not? And if it be not conclusive in one case why is it in another?

Your readers will see at once what sort of reasoners I have to deal with in Tyler and his disciple and parasite. And the fallacy, which is here so palpable, runs throughout the whole book. The plain state of the case is this: The earlier Fathers are silent, say, as to the doctrines A, B, C, and D, whereof Anglicans admit A and B, but reject C and D, which Catholics admit, and blind and prejudiced controversialists, like

Tyler and the Vicar, press their *negative* authority against the latter doctrines, either in utter ignorance that the same argument is fatal to their own cause in behalf of the doctrines A and P, or from gross want of comprehension of the matter. The danger of arguing on Anglican principles may be proved in the case of almost *every* important doctrine. For instance: The Church of England invokes the Holy Ghost in the Litany, and the Thirty-nine Articles assert the Consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost with the Father and the Son. Now I would like to know upon what grounds high church Anglicans—Anglo-Ritualists—can assent to this when they reject the doctrine of Purgatory, or the invocation of Saints, upon the plea of insufficient evidence. For every ancient authority they can produce in favor of the Consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost, I offer to produce as unequivocal an authority in behalf of Purgatory. And for every prayer to the Holy Ghost, I offer to produce as direct an invocation to a Saint. But I shall not allow “Roman” doctrine to be rejected on grounds which would be equally subversive of Trinitarian doctrine; nor have I the slightest hesitation in saying that should there be any Anglo-Ritualist so wretchedly ignorant of the first principles, I will not say of Christianity, but of natural religion, as to be *prepared* to give up his faith in the Holy Trinity, could it be proved to him that the ecclesiastical writers of the first *ten* centuries were perfectly silent on the subject—I have no hesitation, I repeat, in saying that such a person might as profitably, *hic et nunc*, do *without* such a faith as *with* it. Just now the richest sight I can picture would be the Vicar in theological conflict with some one of our able Methodist or Presbyterian ministers. Where would he be if he could not fall back on those Catholic principles which in his “*Strictures*” he *professes* to reject? Nowhere! He would simply be ground to powder. He may have to settle his position with them yet since he has gravely charged against them that they are wanting in respect for the Mother of God. However, that is their affair.

One word more on Tyler as an authority on PALEOGRAPHY. To make out his miserable case he coolly sets aside as spurious

not only works which one or two critics had rejected, but some of the most universally acknowledged works of the Fathers. For instance: he tosses overboard a Homily of St. Gregory Nazianzen, which has been received not only by such writers as Bellarmine, Baronius, and Labbe, but by the Benedictines of St. Maur, Natalis Alexander, Fabricius, Ceillier, Tillemont, Dupin, Baillet, Daillé, Le Clerc, Montagu, Cave, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Palmer, the Oxford editors of "The Library of the Fathers,"—in short by the learned in such matters whatever their creed or communion. The poor ignoramus did not know evidently that St. Jerome, *who studied theology at Constantinople under St. Gregory*, had expressly mentioned it as one of the works of his "Master." *De Viris Illus.*, vol. 2, p. 929. He treats Homilies of St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Basil of Seleucia in the same way. Who but an Oxford "Bachelor of Divinity" could be guilty of such disgusting folly and impertinence! This shows in a few words the character of the book from which the Vicar gets his "thesaurus of information for the public," and to which he refers your readers.

Here I leave Tyler and his book. Let me assure his chief mourner, the Vicar, that it was not less ridiculous for *him* or any other Anglican—high church, low church, broad church, every church, no church—to write a volume on the "Worship of the Blessed Virgin" than it would be for an infidel, who rejects the first principles of Christianity, to write a book on Justification. As only a Christian can *understand* the latter doctrine, so only a Catholic can understand the former.

LETTER XI.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I begin to-day my critique on the Vicar's sixth letter. On the very threshold I am met with the shibboleth—"Forgery," now so stale to your readers. This time he applies

it to the doctrine of the "Assumption of the Blessed Virgin." Now, while nothing could give me greater delight, yet, to treat this subject at all worthily, and in all its bearings, critically, historically, and theologically, would make demands upon your space and my time altogether incommensurate with its relevancy to this discussion. Besides, more captious and extremely shallow, more contemptibly superficial observations were never put forward on a grave topic than those copied by the Vicar from one of his favorite *dictionaries*. I can see nothing to save them from being insulting to the intelligence of your readers but the character for irresponsibility already established by the scribbler who *transfers* them to your columns. But again: he absolves me from any elaborate argument by his own admissions. Speaking of the "Assumption," he says: "All that can be said for it is, that it seems reasonable that if Enoch and Elijah, forerunners of the Messiah, were translated from earth without seeing corruption of their bodies, the mother of the Redeemer ought not to be less honored. It seems fit, certainly, to mere human reason that the body which bore the Son of God should, like His own body, see no corruption." Very good indeed. But it is evident he does not realize the full force of his own words. Common sense, however, like murder, will now and then out—even from the Vicar. It is true that one of his distinguished religious progenitors tells him that "in religious matters Reason is worthless," "Reason is the enemy of all religion," and "in discussing such matters we should leave the jackass Reason at home"; but the Vicar is a "true Catholic," you know, and does not always agree with Martin perhaps. Be it so. I will inform him, then, that Catholicity is not rationalistic, but it is a rational religion, and at every step satisfies the demands of the most rigid reason. The Catholic Church teaches that the exercise of reason necessarily precedes the acceptance of the truths of religion, and that it is an obligation laid upon reason to inquire diligently, and to be certain that those truths which are proposed to its belief, have God for their author, before it gives its assent, in order that it may exercise, according to the teaching of the Apostles, a "reasonable obedience." Surely

truth cannot be in contradiction with the very faculty to which it is addressed—cannot be hostile to that faculty whose natural function is to welcome, assent, and embrace it. Let the Vicar not so dishonor God's noblest gift to man by supposing that the idea of the Assumption, whose *feast* has been celebrated throughout the Christian Church for over *fourteen hundred years*, which has its roots so deep down in the analogies of faith, and which is so logically and so profoundly connected with truths which even in the sixth century were yet in an early stage of development, sprang forth, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, full grown from the brain of some obscure forger.

Reason, he confesses, sanctions the belief of Mary's Assumption. This is a good start. For the present, then, it will suffice to instruct him that its truth rests :

1st, on a *positive* and *direct* tradition, which reaches back until lost in the origin of the Liturgy ; 2d, on a *positive* and *indirect* tradition, which can be traced as far as St. Epiphanius, who died in 403 ; 3d, on *negative* evidence of the highest antiquity, and of the most striking cogency ; 4th, on rigorous theological deduction from other revealed truths ; 5th, on the *Sensus fidelium*, the common voice of the faithful. Here he will find room to work the "Vincentine Canon." Let him give but "six weeks'" conscientious study to the question on these lines and he will find that

Belief is but a higher faculty of Reason

.

As the snow-headed mountain rises o'er

The lightning, and applies itself to Heaven.

Only a word more on this topic. The fact of the *Corporal* Assumption of the Blessed Virgin is not yet a dogma of Catholic faith. It is a "pious belief" recommended by its intrinsic reasonableness, for surely it is natural to suppose that our Divine Lord did not suffer that sacred body in which He himself had dwelt, and from which He had taken His own sacred humanity, to become a prey to corruption. Such is the language of the Fathers in the East and the West from the very

beginning. The belief met not ONE OPPONENT in its progress, and but few sceptics; was received from the first by all schools of theology; has been qualified as certain, not to be denied without rashness, proximate to faith by theologians generally—nay, as *de fide* by the first University of Christendom, that of Paris, in 1497. Instead of spending his time looking at the pictures in the “fine quarto edition of the Breviary,” which the Vicar says he has, let him read the Lessons of the Second Nocturns of the Office of the Breviary for the 15th of August, where he will find the Corporal Assumption categorically asserted and insisted upon by various arguments. Mary is the “living ark of the living God, which has its resting place in the temple of the Lord.” She is the “living Paradise” taken up into heaven; in her the old “curse” of death “is broken.” “The Immaculate Virgin, stained by no earthly affection, did not return to earth,” but, because she was herself a “living heaven, has her place in the tents of heaven.” “How could she taste death, from whom flowed life to all? She did, however, die, because she was a daughter of the old Adam, but she was fitly taken up to the living God because she was His Mother.” “*Animata Arca Dei Viventis quae requiescit in templo Domini.—Hodie Eden novi Adam paradisum suscipit animatum, in quo soluta est condemnatio.—Virgo Immaculata, quae nullis terrenis inquinata est affectibus non in terram reversa est, sed, cum esset animatum coelum, in coelestibus tabernaculis collocatur.—Ex qua enim omnibus vera vita manavit, quomodo illa mortem gastaret? Sed cedit legi latae ab eo quem genuit, et ut filia veteris Adam, veterem sententiam subiit ut autem Dei viventis Mater, ad illum ipsum digne assumitur.*” To compress I quote from but two Lessons of the Nocturns in my Breviary (Totum), p. 892, and translate it as above. These are the thoughts of St. John Damascene (of Damascus), the St. Thomas Aquinas of the Greeks, taken from his second sermon, read on the feast. How sweet its music to the Catholic heart as it rolls up through the ages with ever swelling chorus! A word about St. John. He died about 780, before the schism of the East, and nearly eight hundred years before the world heard of Anglicanism:

This miserable pageant of untruth,
Feeble with three poor centuries of age.

We have the unexceptionable testimony of the Rev. Dr. Cave, an Anglican critic, of Cambridge University, that no man can have a sound judgment, who, reading his works, doth not admire his extraordinary erudition, the justness and precision of his ideas and conceptions, and the strength of his reasoning, especially in theological matters. *Historia Litteraria*, 1688. Recalling the language of this great Father on the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, can your readers wonder that ministers of a church, "by law established," held together by "legal fetters" and "state support" and yet very fast disintegrating, do not think very highly of St. John Damascene? And was it not fitting that a sermon should be preached in the "Mission Chapel" two weeks ago, which was published in your columns, June 27th, in which the preacher seems to go out of his way to insult the memory of a MAN so great, spiritually and intellectually, that, I hope it is not discourteous to say, the preacher would not be worthy to tie the latchet of his shoe? In this sermon St. John is described as a "blind guide leading the blind multitude." Is not this, to thinking men, the very acme of impertinence and disgusting conceit? Would an Anglican so speak of Plato or Aristotle, Marcus Aurelius or Epictetus? O no—but one reason would be that they had written nothing in praise of the Mother of God. Would he so speak of Cardinal Newman, a living saint of the Catholic Church? Were the great old Greek saint walking amongst us what would prevent his lashing such people across the face for their insolence? Nothing but his profound humility or the insignificance of his revilers. Another cause of the dislike felt by Anglicans for St. John of Damascus is to be found in the *second* of his three celebrated discourses against the Iconoclast heretics. The Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, trying on the Privy Council "dodge" and the tactics of Henry VIII., published his edict against holy images in 726. St. John entered the lists against the heresy, and in this discourse he, like another Paul before Agrippa,

points out to the emperor that though he was entrusted with the government of the state he had no authority *to make decisions in points of ecclesiastical doctrine*. But after all, "blind" as St. John Damascene may have been, will he not compare favorably with the "fathers" of the English Reformation whom Littledale calls "utterly unredeemed villains," "a set of miscreants," and who says that "Robespierre, Danton, Marat . . . merit quite as much respect as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer"?

But enough. "Enoch and Elijah were translated from earth without seeing corruption of their bodies," says the Vicar. Why not Mary? Every Catholic believes it. It would, therefore, be a great glory to scientific theology, and a great joy to its professors if this pious belief were to receive the final sanction of a dogmatic definition. And I do hope and pray that before I utter my *Nunc dimittis* to this world, I may have lived to see the edifice of Mary's peerless glories crowned by a solemn declaration, that the Catholic Church believes and teaches the integral Assumption of the Mother of God as a part of Divine Revelation.

The Vicar next takes up, under the heading "Forgery," my quotation from the hymn of Prudentius. This I have already disposed of in a previous letter, together with the stale slander on Bishop Strossmayer which the Vicar, lately in your columns, pathetically complains is a "fresh subject" because, no doubt, of its terrible force as an *argumentum ad hominem*. His cries for help from his "friends in England" on Prudentius, will bring him no relief. The cowardice displayed in thus sneaking out of a difficulty, instead of manfully meeting it, forcefully emphasizes the character and controversial methods of the man who could dare to write: "We cannot trust a quotation (the Church of Rome) gives from ancient authors till we have thoroughly sifted the evidence in their favor." Though such a statement from his pen merits as little attention as that of a lunatic who would assert that two and two make eight, I would like to follow at length the reflections it suggests. If I did the Vicar would be "after you" for allowing me to introduce a "fresh subject" and have as much cause for wincing and whin-

ing as the Strossmayer *exposé* gave him. But I cannot, in justice to your readers, let it wholly pass. "Ancient authors" indeed? How many would we have but for the "Church of Rome"! To whom are we indebted for those monuments of Christian antiquity, the writings of the Fathers, *hers* not *his* nor of any of his Theological kith or kin, over the very "copious indices" of which he labored for "six weeks," with such stupid results, to find arguments against her? To whom are we indebted for the transmission to us *intact* of the Holy Scriptures themselves?

Now, I do not forget the claims of our modern Protestant scholars, and I am proud of them,—Niebuhr, Mommsen, Boehmer, Ranke, Pertz, Durny, Gibbon, Grote, Hallam, Milner, Stubbs, Freeman; but their names had been writ in water but for the "Church of Rome." She put into their hands the boundless treasures she had gathered up, preserved and accumulated in her majestic march through the ages—else, their occupation was gone. Blot out what the "Church of Rome" has done for the study of history,—historical criticism, the materials on which it is exercised and its results as we enjoy them to-day, and the remainder you might put away in your waistcoat pocket. Let me prove this, though I will give but a merely suggestive sketch. My authorities will be entirely Protestant, of great name and now living—Wattenbach, Gardthausen, writers in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and the Rev. Prof. Stokes, an Anglican Canon, in his article in the *Contemporary Review* for January, 1883, entitled—"The Bollandists," which I heartily commend to your readers as a generous portrayal of the spirit and the labors of many imperial sons of the "Church of Rome." I propose to speak magisterially now, as I can well afford to do, and I invite the Vicar if he has any learned "friends in England" or out of it, of Oxford or Cambridge either, to seek their assistance, should he desire to dispute my statements.

I need not here speak of the great qualities of the present illustrious Pope, Leo XIII. His wisdom, his learning, his single-mindedness, his spotless character, his deep interest in all the arts and sciences, his true and sincere solicitude for the welfare of religion and society, have been duly applauded by the whole world. A few years ago when throwing open the Vati-

can Archives to scholars for the purpose of historical research, he used these words—I need not give his own sonorous Latin—: “History, the guide of life and the light of truth, is one of those arms most fit to defend the Church,” and—“the first law of history is to dread uttering falsehood; the next, not to fear stating the truth; the last, that the historian’s writing should be open to no suspicion of partiality or of animosity.” One is reminded of the apostrophe of Lecky, the historian of Rationalism, to the grandeur of St. Peter’s at Rome: “There lie those mediæval Pontiffs who had borne aloft the lamp of knowledge in an evil and benighted age, who had guided and controlled the march of nations.” Is Pope Leo the first Pope that furthers the study of history—of the “Ancient Authors”? Let me inquire shortly what the “Church of Rome” has done for both.

Protestant Germany is to-day the leader in this branch of learning, but she began her work only yesterday. Fitful attempts had previously been made, but it was only after the great Napoleonic wars, when a new national spirit arose among the Germans, that the efforts of Arndt and Grimm, and especially of Von Stein, were crowned with success. Not till 1819 was it possible to found the society for the study of Old German History. Pertz was the leading spirit, and his great work, the “*Monumenta*” represents the high-water mark of even German self-sacrifice, learning, judgment and vigor in the 19th century in this department. But the “Church of Rome” helped him in his work. He visited Rome on his first journey of research in 1820 and Wattenbach says “he received from the Papal Regesta alone 1800 unprinted documents.” Kennicott, the renowned Oxford Hebrew Biblical scholar, had been treated in the same way, as he so cordially acknowledges in his letters. Now, up to the time of Pertz nothing had been done by Protestants (I do not forget the good Leibnitz’s work) that could be at all compared with the great historical collections undertaken and carried out by Catholics. The “Church of Rome” was the leader in the cause of historical progress. Hear Canon Stokes on the matter: “It was the existence and rich endowments of the great monasteries,” says he, “which explains the publication of such immense works as those of the Bollandists,

Mabillon and Tillemont, quite surpassing any now issued, even by the wealthiest publishers among ourselves, and only approached, and that at a distance, by Pertz's 'Monumenta' in Germany." Surely this is glory enough, but it is not all. Let me untwist for your readers this quotation from this Anglican scholar. The Church of England has many such *at home*, but she sends curious specimens to *the Colonies* now and then.

One of the most gigantic historical works ever undertaken was the *Acta Sanctorum* of a company of Flemish Jesuits, called Bollandists from their founder, John Bolland. "Their majestic tomes," says Canon Stokes, "stand as everlasting protests on behalf of real and learned inquiry, of accurate, painstaking and most *critical* research into the sources whence history, if worth anything, must be drawn." During this century, the Belgian Jesuits considered it a matter of honor to continue and complete the vast work begun by their brethren of old, and the whole work published to the present time numbers *sixty-four folio volumes*. They include a great part of the history of the world since the establishment of Christianity. "I regard the *Acta Sanctorum*," says Prof. Stokes, "as especially valuable for Mediæval history, *secular* as well as ecclesiastical, simply because the authors, having had unrivalled opportunities of obtaining and copying documents, printed their authorities as they found them, and thus preserved for us a mine of historical material which otherwise would have perished in the French revolution and its subsequent wars." He may well express his surprise that "neither of our own great historians who have dealt with the middle ages, Gibbon and Hallam, has, as far as we have been able to discover, ever consulted them." To prove how valuable the mine is, Prof. Stokes cites the titles of some of the critical treatises in the work. Of the honesty of the Bollandists, which, according to Pope Leo, is the essential condition, the first, second, and third law of all history, Canon Stokes says: "This much any fair mind will allow: The Society of Jesus, since the days of Pascal and the Provincial Letters, has been regarded as a synonym of dishonesty and fraud. From any such charge the student of the *Acta Sanctorum* must regard the Bollandists as free. . . . We find

in them thorough loyalty to historical truth ; they deal in no suppression of evidence ; they give every side of the question. They write like men who feel, as Bollandus their founder did, that *under no circumstances is it right to lie*. They never hesitate to avow their own convictions and predilections ; they draw their own conclusions and put their own gloss upon fact and document ; but they give the documents as they found them." In my first quotation from Canon Stokes he mentioned the name of Mabillon. What glorious memories it evokes ! Yet he was but one of the fifteen thousand writers produced by the Order of St. Benedict. It would require a whole letter to speak at all adequately of the works of the French Benedictine monks of St. Maur alone. On the same plane as the great Jesuit work, Wattenbach places their *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti* in nine large folios which he says "are of the utmost importance to history."

Again he says : "After these industrious and learned monks had rendered the most extraordinary services to the history of their order and the church, and in various collections had made accessible unlimited historical material, they began in 1738 to publish the *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France* by Dom Bouquet and his successors, a collection the publication of which has been taken up quite recently, and now consists of *twenty-one folio volumes*." I cannot stay to speak of Ughelli, Baronius, Paperoch, Tillemont, d'Achery, Germain, Ruinart, the brothers Pez, or Father Muratori. Of the last writer Wattenbach says : "His *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, in *twenty-one folio volumes*, are the first comprehensive systematic collection of the documentary history of any country, and to this day the only one which has reached completion." To publish his vast collection, 48 volumes in all, several princes and nobles of Italy subscribed \$4,000 each. Again Wattenbach says : "The history of the Roman Church, written by Cardinal Baronius, embraced the whole Christian world, and in it every nation found the most important information regarding its own past from the treasures of the Vatican Archives."

I cannot more fitly sum up this part of my reflections than in the words of Matthew Arnold, our great critic, recently

dead. Speaking of the great library of England, he says: "In spite of all the shocks which the feeling of a good Catholic has in this Protestant country inevitably to undergo, in spite of the contemptuous insensibility to the grandeur of Rome which he finds so general and so hard to bear, how much has he to console him, how many acts of homage to the greatness of his religion may he see, if he has his eyes open. I will tell him one of them. Let him go, in London, to that delightful spot . . . the reading-room of the British Museum. Let him visit its sacred quarter, the region where its theological books are placed. . . . He will find an immense Catholic work . . . lording it over that whole region, reducing to insignificance the feeble Protestant forces which hang upon its skirts. Protestantism is duly represented, indeed; Mr. Panizzi knows his business too well to suffer it to be otherwise; all the varieties of Protestantism are there; there is the library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, learned, decorous, exemplary, but a *little uninteresting*; there are the works of Calvin, rigid, militant, menacing; there are the works of Dr. Chalmers, the Scotch Thistle, valiantly doing duty as the Rose of Sharon, but keeping something very Scotch about it all the time; there are the works of Dr. Channing, the last word of religious philosophy in a land where every one has some culture, and where superiorities are discountenanced—the flower of moral and intelligent mediocrity. *But how are all these divided against one another, and how, though they were all united, are they dwarfed by the Catholic Leviathan, their neighbor?* Majestic in its blue and gold unity, this fills shelf after shelf and compartment after compartment, its right mounting up into heaven among the white folios of the *Acta Sanctorum*, its left plunging down into hell among the yellow octavos of the Law Digest. Everything is there, in that immense *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, in that *Encyclopédie Théologique*, that *Nouvelle Encyclopédie Théologique*, that *Troisième Encyclopédie Théologique*; religion, philosophy, history, biography, arts, sciences, Bibliography, gossip. The work embraces the whole range of human interests; like one of the great Middle Age Cathedrals, it is in itself a study for a life. Like the net

in Scripture, it drags everything to land, bad and good, lay and ecclesiastical, sacred and profane, so that it be but matter of human concern. Wide-embracing as the power whose product it is! A power, for history, at any rate, eminently **THE CHURCH.**" How beautiful! How true!

LETTER XII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—In my last letter I considered the world's debt to the "Church of Rome" and her sons for their labors to promote historical science. I wish shortly to contrast these with the spirit of the Church of England and *her* sons—the Vicar's theological progenitors. The closing words of his "Strictures" are these: "May the God of Truth in His mercy hasten the time" when "we shall behold a disastrous collapse for the Roman Church of her extensive and expensive plant in the *good old Country.*" Now the unctious piety of this despondent and despairing ejaculation does not redeem its blasphemy, as your readers will presently confess. History indeed may repeat itself, for John Bull is a vagarious sort of fellow, to say nothing of the theological *bull-ies* who now and then escape from his shores. The "good old country" once had a good deal of "expensive plant" belonging to the "Roman Church." The "plant" *was* "expensive" because it was the coinage of the very life-blood of men who had pledged their thought and power, and had consecrated their lives to the promotion of the knowledge and love of the God of Truth, and the happiness and well-being of their fellows. Let us inquire what the Church of England and her sons of this "good old country" did with this "plant." My authorities, remember, all through, are Protestants, not "St. Liguori" or "the Racolta"—these will come by and by.

Before the brutal lust of Henry VIII. begat Anglicanism,

many monasteries, those historic homes of great learning and greater virtue, existed in England. They all had their libraries. In those of the greater monasteries were deposited the Acts of Parliament after the coming of the Normans; and under the English Saxons the principal decrees of the Witenagemote and Gemote. In several monasteries Registers of the Kings and public transactions were compiled and preserved, *some* of which we fortunately have, as the Saxon annals or chronicles, published by Gibson at Oxford in 1692. From such monastic chronicles Florence of Worcester and William of Malmesbury, declare they compiled their histories. The destruction of these monuments are an irreparable loss to English history. Tyrell, in his "History of England," p. 152, says: "From the conversion of the Saxons most of the laws made in the Witenagemote, or great Councils, were carefully preserved, and would have been conveyed to us more entire, had it not been for the loss of so many curious monuments of antiquity at the suppression of the monasteries, in the reign of Henry VIII." But worse than that. Fanaticism and more than vandal rage did not even spare the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge, especially the two most noble public libraries at Oxford, the one founded by Richard of Burg, or Richard Aungerville, Lord-treasurer of England and Bishop of Durham, in the reign of Edward III., who spared no pains or cost to make this collection complete; the other, furnished with books by Thomas Cobham, Bishop of Worcester, in 1367, and exceedingly augmented by King Henry IV., his sons, and by the addition of the celebrated library of the Duke of Gloucester, filled with curious manuscripts brought, at any price, from foreign countries. Read the words of Chamberlain in his work entitled "*Present State of England*," part 3, p. 450: "These men," says he, "under pretence of rooting out Popery, superstition, and idolatry, utterly destroyed these two noble libraries, and embezzled, sold, burnt, or tore in pieces all those valuable books which these great patrons of learning had been so diligent in procuring in every country of Europe. Nay, their fury was so successful as to the Aungerville library, which was the oldest, largest, and choicest, that we have not so much

as a catalogue of the books left. Nor did they rest here. They visited likewise the college-libraries, and one may guess at the work they made with them, by a letter still kept in the Archives, where one of them boasts that New College quadrangle was all covered with the leaves of their torn books. The University thought fit to complain to the government of this barbarity and covetousness of the visitors, but could not get any more than one single book . . . and to this day there is no book in the Bodleian Library besides this and two more which are certainly known to have belonged to either of the former libraries. Nay, and the University itself, despairing ever to enjoy any other public library, thought it advisable to dispose of the very desks and shelves the books stood on *in the year 1555.*¹ The time was certainly not auspicious for Roman "plant." Your readers had a glimpse at what the "Church of Rome" did—"Look here on *this* picture and on *that*."

Hitherto I have discussed the *quantitative* aspect of the historical work of the "Church of Rome" among the "Ancient Authors." There remains now to consider the *quality* of that work—the value of those materials, in amassing which her sons led lives of ceaseless, unwearied toil, as tested by historical criticism. Here they have pushed erudition to the very point of genius. By historical criticism I mean the probing of historical testimony; its acceptance, if found to be true, no matter how contrary to the historian's sympathies; its rejection, if false, no matter how strongly it favored his views and theories. To probe historical testimony is to inquire whether documents are genuine or spurious, whether the witnesses are partial or unprejudiced, whether the facts harmonize with or contradict other ascertained facts. Now your readers will remember my quotation from Whitaker, an Anglican minister and historian,

¹ Read Mr. Gladstone's burning words on this satanically-inspired vandalism. In his article *On Books and the Housing of them*, in the *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1890, he says: "Oxford had . . . received noble gifts for her University Library. And we have to recollect with shame and indignation that that institution was plundered and destroyed by the Commissioners of the boy king, Edward the Sixth, acting in the name of the Reformation of Religion."

who says: "Forgery—I blush for the honor of Protestants while I write it—seems to have been peculiar to the Reformers." According to Littledale this must be true, but I think it too sweeping. In this "vale of tears" the true and the false will ever move along together, as a body and its shadow. There are always realities, there are always shams—tributes to the real things. Forgeries are committed to-day—it was so in the past, and it will be so in the future while human nature remains as it is. In historical work, which is based so largely on the study of documents, public and private, state and ecclesiastical, much depends on the character of these documents, or diplomas, as they were called. *The "Church of Rome" stands to-day unequalled in the whole science of Paleography, Greek and Latin.* The world has nothing to compare with the treatises written by her sons to establish the true principles for distinguishing genuine from forged documents. My authority is the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, not by any means partial to her. I refer your readers to Vol. 7, Art. "Diplomatics," and Vol. 18, Art. "Palæography." The immortal Pope, Innocent III. (1195–1216), issued a decretal laying down rules for detecting forged bulls. In 1675 Paperoch, the illustrious Bollandist Jesuit, wrote his *Propylæum Antiquarium circa veri ac falsi discrimen in vetustis membranis*, freely translated—"The Antiquary's Introduction to the art of distinguishing the true from the false in old manuscripts." Your readers will not have forgotten Canon Stokes' testimony to the character of the Bollandists. With a view to establish the credit of those documents preserved in the original, the Benedictine Monk, Mabillon, in the year 1681, produced his masterly work, called by Magliabechi an "immortal book," *De Re Diplomatica*—on "Diplomatics." In 1750–1765 appeared the *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique* by Dom Toussaint and Dom Tassin, Benedictine Monks of St. Maur, 6 vols., quarto, treating of the whole subject of Diplomas, and accordingly entering at length into a minute investigation of the peculiarities and characteristics of writing proper to different ages and countries. Hear the *Britannica*: "The bibliography of Latin paleography in its different branches is very extensive, but there are compara-

tively few books which deal with it as a whole. The most complete work is due to the Benedictines, who in 1750-1765 produced the *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique*, which examines the remains of Latin writing in the most exhaustive manner. . . . As their title shows, they did not confine themselves to the study of MS. volumes, but dealt also with that other branch of paleography, the study of documents, in which they had been preceded by Mabillon in his *De Re Diplomatica*." In these monumental works the Benedictine Monks, therefore, not only laid the foundation of the critical study of Latin historical documents but almost brought it to perfection. They classified the writings of different periods and countries, thus establishing external tests of the genuineness of manuscripts, and *founding* the science of Latin Paleography. By minute study and careful analysis they also established and set down many internal criteria, such as the wording of titles, the value of geographical terms at different times, and contemporary chronology, which are in some ways even more certain and more serviceable than the external tests. These latter are dealt with in the science of Diplomatics.

But the Benedictines were not satisfied with these achievements. What Mabillon, Toustain and Tassin did for Latin documents and Paleography, that the great Montfaucon did for Greek. "The first book," says the *Britannica*, "which dealt with the subject in a systematic manner was the *Palaeographia Graeca* of the learned Benedictine Dom Bernard Montfaucon, published in 1708. So thoroughly well was the work done, that down to our time no other scholar attempted to improve upon it, and Montfaucon remained the undisputed authority on this branch of learning." To-day a distinguished German Protestant, *Gardthausen*, is trying to improve upon Montfaucon. He says: "*The Palaeographia Graeca* is and will remain one of the most remarkable achievements by which a new science was not only founded, but, as it seemed, also perfected. It is the more remarkable, as Montfaucon had no one to precede him, but created everything from nothing."

Again: *Dates* supply most useful and reliable ways of checking historical documents. Hence the importance for pur-

poses of historical criticism of a sound, detailed and systematic Chronology. The father of Chronology was Joseph Scaliger, a Protestant, who in 1583 published his work, *De Emendatione Temporum*, on the "Correction of Time." He soon found not only critics but fellow-workers in the learned Jesuits Sirmond, Labbe and Petavius, whose book on Chronology appeared in 1627, and remained as authority for a long time. But in 1750 was published "the first edition in one volume, quarto, of *L'Art de Verifier les Dates*—'The Art of Verifying Dates,' which in its third edition (1818-1831) appeared in 38 volumes, 8vo, a colossal monument of the learning and labors of various members of the Benedictine Congregation of St. Maur." *Encyc. Britannica*, vol. 5, Art. "Chronology."

[Let me complete the above sketch of the labors of Catholic scholars in the interests of truth, with the name of Cardinal Mai. He was the most consummate critic, in our time, of ancient texts and MSS., and his splendid labors attracted the attention and admiration of all Europe. His sagacity and genius in deciphering Palimpsest MSS. were supreme, and have never been equalled. His merits in this particular were heartily recognized by the best scholarship of England; for, a few years before his death (1854), a gold medal was there struck in his honor, bearing the following inscription: "*Angelo Maio, Palimpsestorum Inventori atque Restauratori*—To Angelo Mai, the discoverer and restorer of Palimpsest MSS."]

Now here I intend to say a word on two famous documents of the Middle Ages, the *Donatio Constantini*—the "Donatian of Constantine," and the "Forged Decretals" about which, copying Littledale, the Vicar made some noise, and to which I have already referred in this *Rejoinder*. We have just seen how the Jesuits and Benedictines vied with each other in providing tools for the critical historians. But long before Pape-roch and Mabillon, long before Tassin, Petavius, and Dom Clement, the principal compiler of "The Art of verifying Dates," Catholic scholars had given proof that they possessed both the keenness, the learning and the impartial love of truth which distinguishes the true critic. Perhaps I can give no

better proof of this shortly, than the story of the two documents above. On the first, many mediæval writers based the temporal power of the Pope, while the second was used to fortify many other papal rights. But scarcely had the Renaissance set in, scarcely had the study of history been reawakened, when Catholic historians and scholars, churchmen, too, nay Bishops and Cardinals, began to doubt the genuineness of these two important documents, and finally condemned them as spurious. It is well known that Laurentius Valla condemned the *Donatio Constantini* in unmeasured terms. "Doubts of the genuineness of this Document" says Prof. L. Pastor, "had been expressed years before Valla by the learned Nicholas of Cusa in his *Catholic Concordance*. Independently of Valla and Cusa, Reginald Pecock, Bishop of Chichester, showed after careful examination of the historical testimony, the impossibility of upholding this document so long looked upon as genuine. In 1443 Silvio Piccolomini, afterwards Pope Pius II., urged Frederick III. to bring the question of the Donation of Constantine before a Council." As to the False Decretals, the Popes have often been accused of having had them compiled and partly forged to back up some of their pretensions. It is now established that this collection was made in the Frankish Empire between the years 852-7. The then reigning Pope, Nicholas I., did not so much as know of its existence till 864. Subsequently for several centuries this forgery was looked upon as genuine; but even during the "dark" ages, long before Luther, Petrus Comestor, in the twelfth century, doubted its authenticity. In 1324 Marsilius of Padua pronounced it a forgery, and in the fifteenth century its genuineness was not admitted by Persona, Kalteisen, Cardinal Cusa, and John of Turrecemata. [These are crucial facts. Two documents, supposed to support strongly certain Papal claims, one a forgery which imposed upon the Jesuit Turrianus even in 1573, were rejected by the critics of the Middle Ages, most of them priests and bishops, before the schism of Luther, and, therefore, *solely in the interest of truth*.] See Hergenröther, "anti-Janus," and Prof. Herbermann, *A. C. Q. Review*, April, 1888.

I trust I have now eviscerated the Vicar's "thesaurus" on "forgeries and falsifications" of the "Church of Rome" and to the satisfaction of your readers. When next they meet him with a *yard stick* in one hand and the "*critical apparatus*" in the other, and hear him talk of "sifting the evidence" of Roman quotations from the "ancient authors" they can "hold their sides." Your readers, however, may justly complain of the length of this *Rejoinder*, but when they consider the space I am obliged to occupy in refutation of so miserable a statement as that with which I have just been dealing, I can fairly claim their indulgence. I have felt obliged to track him, step by step, through his irrelevant ravings, for the sake of the "God of Truth" and His little ones. In my next we will get nearer to the question which he did his little best to befog—if, indeed, he is responsible at all.

LETTER XIII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I continue my critique on the Vicar's sixth letter. He says: "I now pass to the consideration of my opponent's remarks on the Papal Decree of the Immaculate Conception." Your readers will remember that in my *Résumé* I was led to consider the "Papal Decree"—the Bull *INEFFABILIS*—on the Immaculate Conception by the Vicar's statement "that Pius IX. when promulgating the dogma . . . alluded for its defence to this very text" (Genesis iii. 15), and by Bishop Kingdon's assertion "that the mistake *Ipsa* for *Ipse* had acquired a tremendous importance from being quoted in the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by Pius IX." I have already so fully disposed of both of these silly and ignorant utterances that there is nothing to add in the nature of argument; but a little expansion here will the better enable

the ordinary reader to take in the ineptness and imbecility of the Vicar when he lets go the hands of Pusey and Littledale and attempts to step alone. The exhibition is indeed a sorry one.

It was quite evident from the Vicar's statement and that of the Bishop, anent the "Decree," that they had *never* read it; but the Vicar now comes into court and confesses it. "I have not a copy of the Bull *INEFFABILIS*," he says, "but I possess a long extract in English by Dr. Pusey." This is pretty good, but only characteristic of the "Priest" (save the mark!) who with audacious "cheek" and insulting impudence puts himself forward as qualified to instruct the public on the "apostacy," "infidelity" and "idolatry" of the Roman church! Of course, my opponents were not *obliged* to read the "Decree," but then they would not be expected to know much about the "tremendous importance" of its alleged mistakes. By overlooking this fact they have brought upon themselves the shame and humiliation that covers them to-day. May the "penance" chasten their love (!) for the Roman "branch" of their ideal Church Universal!

I give again for convenience and point Genesis iii. 15: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; *he (she or it)* shall crush thy head, &c." This celebrated text is divided into *two* parts: the first of which declares that God will place a barrier of enmity between the serpent and the woman, between his seed and her seed; and the *second* expresses the consequences that should result from this enmity, namely, the crushing of the serpent's head. I put, in the *second* clause, the three received readings that your readers may see that "*Ipsa—she*" has absolutely no weight or bearing on the promulgation of the "Decree" on the Immaculate Conception, or on the doctrine itself, and that its "tremendous importance" is only a figment of a badly diseased anti-Roman episcopal imagination. By all three renderings, as I have so frequently proved, Catholics understand, admit and assert that the agent in crushing the serpent's head is the seed of the woman, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Hitherto, I have considered the Vicar's imbecility as the offspring of malevo-

lence, but I will now prove that it is *congenital*. He is as blind as a bat and has actually put himself and the Bishop out of court. Let your readers follow me sharply here.

In my *Résumé* I said, that the *first clause* of our text was quoted *twice* in the "Decree" and *verbatim*, while the *second clause* was only "referred to indirectly, and the idea expressed paraphrastically" with the meaning already fully explained. I did not say whether it was so referred to once or twice as the Vicar impudently asserts, but to teach him a lesson in fearless honesty in dealing with religious topics, I gave him (what he could not get from Pusey) the original Latin, with a translation, of the strongest language in his favor in the "Decree." Yet he says: "I hope he is not suppressing anything!" Why did he not get the "Decree" and read it before "rushing into print"? Besides, as "Nothing good can come out of Nazareth," he surely owed it to your readers to "verify" the quotations of one so "thoroughly Jesuitical" as he charges me with being. I gave the two quotations from the 12th and 17th sections of the decree as follows: "But (God) also raised in a wonderful manner the hopes of our race when he said—'I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed.' They (the Fathers) have taught that in this divine declaration was clearly and plainly showed forth the merciful Redeemer of the human race—namely, Jesus Christ;" again, the 17th section: "Then, too, they (the Fathers) published their belief . . . that her (the Blessed Virgin's) coming was foretold by God himself on the occasion when He said to the serpent—'I will put enmities between thee and the woman.'" On these quotations the Vicar remarks: "My opponent's contention is that because the text Genesis iii. 15 is not quoted in full in the two first instances (12th and 17th sections of the Bull) that therefore the Patristic and Papal comments thereon have no reference to the second clause." Nonsense! I was guilty of no such stupid "contention." Why, the Catholic sense of the second clause is included in the comment—"that in this divine declaration was clearly and plainly showed forth the merciful Redeemer of the human race—namely, Jesus Christ." How? Because He was the seed of the woman spoken of, who by His Divine and

Almighty power was to effectuate the result of the declared enmity, namely, the crushing of the serpent's head. What becomes of *Ipsa* then? It is not thought of at all in the calumnious sense of the Bishop and his Vicar, and this they could have known had they read the closing words of the 12th Section immediately after my quotation, as follows: "Wherefore, as Christ, the Mediator between God and man, has, by assuming human nature, blotted out the handwriting of the decree of condemnation against us, and as *Conqueror* fastened it to the cross, so, in like manner, the most holy Virgin, linked to Him in the closest and most indissoluble bonds, *in union with Him and through Him* . . . has completely crushed his head under her immaculate heel." Did not St. Paul express the same idea when he prayed on behalf of the Roman Christians—"May the God of peace crush Satan speedily under your feet?" But why should I dwell longer on this? The Catholic sense of the *Second clause* is common throughout the ages of the church. Permit me one lightsome illustration. Two of the most illustrious names commemorated in the church to-day are Saints Perpetua and Felicitas. They were martyred during the violent persecution under the Emperor Severus, in 202. Their "Acts" to the eve of martyrdom, were written by St. Perpetua herself and we have them now. They are quoted by Tertullian in his book—"De anima—on the soul," ch. 55, Clarke's "Ante-Nicene Library," vol. xv. I refer the Vicar to the Oxonian editor of these "Acts" as well as to Dodwell (Diss. Cypr. A. n. 8, 15). While imprisoned, with her brother, in one of those horrible ancient Roman dungeons and doubtful about her fate, St. Perpetua records that the following took place: "One day my brother said to me: 'Sister, I am persuaded that you are a peculiar favorite of Heaven; pray to God to reveal to you whether this imprisonment will end in Martyrdom or not, and acquaint me of it.' I, knowing God gave me daily tokens of His goodness, answered, full of confidence, I will inform you to-morrow! I, therefore, asked that favor of God and had this vision: I saw a golden ladder which reached from earth to the heavens, but so narrow that only one could mount at a time. To the two sides were fastened all kinds of iron in-

struments, as swords, lances, hooks and knives; so that if any one went up carelessly he was in great danger of having his flesh torn by these weapons. At the foot of the ladder lay a dragon of an enormous size, who kept guard to turn back and terrify those that endeavored to mount it. The first that went up was Saturus, who was not apprehended with us, but voluntarily surrendered himself afterwards on our account. When he had got to the top of the ladder he turned towards me and said: 'Perpetua, I wait for you; but take care lest the dragon bite you!' I answered: 'In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, he shall not hurt me!' Then the dragon, as if afraid of me, gently lifted his head from under the ladder, and I, having got upon the first step, *set my foot upon his head. Thus I mounted to the top.* As soon as I had related to my brother this vision, we both concluded that we should suffer death." See the Benedictine Ruinart's—"*Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta*"—"recueil inspiré d'un véritable esprit critique" says a learned French Protestant writer. Also Orsi's "Vindication of the Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas." St. Augustine has a celebrated sermon on this episode from which I will translate a thought or two. The Vicar can "verify" at his leisure. He will find the sermon, too, by using one of his "copious indices," or perhaps some of his "learned friends" may save him the trouble by giving him the reference off-hand. Only let him remember it is not St. John of Damascus, but *St. Augustine*. The saint says: "The dragon, therefore, was crushed by the chaste foot and the conquering tread when the upraised ladder was pointed out by which the blessed Perpetua was to go to God. Thus the head of the old serpent which was a stumbling-block (*præcipitium*) to the falling woman (Eve) was made a stepping-stone (*gradus*) to her (Perpetua) who was ascending." This sermon of the great African Doctor is indeed a monument more lasting than brass erected to commemorate the crushing of the serpent's head by the pure and gentle Perpetua. Now, if such an imagination were soul-stirring to so great and tender a human heart and one so miraculously attuned to divine harmonies as that of Augustine, need we wonder that he said such "excellent things" of Mary and that he clung to

the reading *Ipsa* of the old Vulgate (as I have pointed out), which expresses the same idea, but in a manner altogether super-eminent as is becoming to her who is the "Chief of Saints." Let me express the hope that when the Vicar next visits Rome, and sees "a memorial column . . . on the top of which stands a figure of the Blessed Virgin (without the holy child, mark you, in her arms) trampling the serpent under foot"—let me express the most sympathetic concern and fond hope that "this representation of the bruising of the serpent's head *by the woman*," which was as "common among Roman Catholics" in the days of St. Perpetua and as familiar to them as it is to-day, will not so shock and paralyze his "true Catholic" feelings as to prevent his going to the Propaganda to purchase a new edition of "an English copy of the *Raccolta*," published in the United States, to which he could apply his *yard stick* and the "Vincentian Canon" and learn how it squared with "Little-dale's quotations."

Commenting on my extract from the 17th clause of the Decree as given above, the Vicar makes the following sapient remark: "Is it not evident that the prophecy of the woman's coming is in the second part of the text which contains that very corrupted reading, *Ipsa*," and he exclaims—"What a very unsafe guide my opponent seems to be to the understanding of the plainest texts and comments." Can your readers diagnose the mental condition of a man who could so write? Who is the seed of the woman, *par excellence*, divinely prophesied in the *first* part of the text? Undoubtedly Christ. Who is the woman, predicted in the same part as the enemy of Satan, whose Seed Christ was? Surely, just as undoubtedly Mary. Even Pusey has to admit this. Now, what has *Ipsa* to do with this prophecy? Please tell us, O Oxford exegete!

Nothing remains of the Vicar's Sixth Letter but a quotation from Pusey as follows: "Dr. Pusey distinctly says (*Eirenicon*, I. 168) that the error of Gen. iii. 15 became the support of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and gives rise to the statements in De Montfort (an influential Roman writer) that God has never made or formed but one enmity; but it is an irreconcilable one, which shall endure and develop unto the end. It is be-

tween *Mary*, His worthy Mother, and the devil; between *the children* and the servants of *Mary* and the children and instruments of Lucifer." The first part of this quotation I have long since disposed of. What shall I say of the second? It literally takes away one's breath. Pusey declares that this supposed error gave rise to the statements, that God had made an enmity between Mary and the devil, between her seed or children, and his seed. Good Heaven! Gave rise to the statements! Why, the words are those of Almighty God Himself! If the whole of the *second clause*—"He, (*she or it*), shall crush thy head"—had never been written, that statement would have been as plain and undeniable as it is now. It would have been equally impossible to doubt the fact that God had established an enmity between Mary and the devil; unless one had preferred to reject the Bible itself, as explained by reason and universal tradition, rather than accept it. For the *first clause* of the verse, at all events, is unquestioned. Here there are no variations or various readings. Protestants, equally with Catholics, admit the words as they stand. The authorized Anglican version renders the Hebrew: "I will put enmity between thee and *the Woman*." It retains, therefore, the force of the Hebrew article. It is *the woman*, between whom and the devil, God declares that He will put enmity—*that woman, one*, that is, who should be well known, easily recognized, in the new order of grace. And there can be no mistake as to who is meant. For it is *that woman*, whose seed is to crush the serpent's head. It must be Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and she alone, to whom these words allude. And, so, as every student of Patristic Theology knows, the Fathers generally understood them. St. Irenæus in the second century leads the way; though he gives the masculine reading of the *second clause*. Not once only, but in several places he explicitly interprets *the woman*, announced in the Protevangel to mean our blessed Lady. Origen follows Irenæus. The pseudo-Origen makes a third; St. Epiphanius, a fourth; Severianus, Bishop of Gabala, a fifth; the author of the letter *De Viro Perfecto*, who is pronounced by Vallarsius, St. Maximus of Turin, a sixth; Fulbert of Chartrain, a seventh;

and St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers, an eighth. In consequence, the Fathers were accustomed to ascribe "to the Blessed Virgin directly and personally" what Pusey tells us was "promised as to (sic) the Person of our Lord." Cardinal Newman has demonstrated this assertion from the writings of St. Justin, Tertullian, St. Irenæus, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Ephraem, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome, St. Peter Crysologus, and St. Fulgentius. See Newman's "*Letter to Pusey*"—an unexampled piece of work. How could a man of Pusey's learning and ability, with any show of reason affirm that the substitution of "She" for "He" or "It" gave rise to the statement that God had never formed but one enmity; and that was between Mary and the devil—between Mary's children or seed, and the seed of the devil? This is the doctrine which Almighty God Himself has revealed as the foundation of Christian hope. I have an explanation which I will give later on. As for the Vicar, I would plead for mercy with your readers. He simply swallowed *whole* Pusey's assertion without having the knowledge necessary to correct it. He probably, too, thought it "advantageous to our church" to send it around. To the mind of a ritualistic "Priest" "the end justifies the means" where Rome is concerned, all considerations of truth and self-respect to the contrary notwithstanding.'

LETTER XIV.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—I begin to-day my examination of the Vicar's seventh letter—and last. His "Strictures" are certainly not open to the charge of permitting your readers the luxury of indulging the "fond imagination" that—

This honest creature, doubtless
Sees and knows more, much more, than he unfolds.

¹ See Father Harper, l. c., p. 345.

In his sixth letter he told us he was "becoming convinced" of the "tremendous importance" of *Ipsa*; and now he comes forward with the announcement of a veritable treasure-trove, and he fairly staggers under the burden of the great thought he has to deliver. "I have made a valuable find," he says, "which if discovered earlier would have saved trouble and space. On referring to the Jesuit Schouppe . . . I find a summary history of the Immaculate Conception followed by its proofs. The first is from Scripture. *In the forefront* stands Gen. iii. 15, with its corrupt *Ipsa* in full, and dependent upon it are three texts, Is. vii. 14, Gal. iv. 4, Lu. i. 26." He recalls with sorrow the outlay of "trouble and space"—the "six weeks' incubation, and the "yards" of "useful information"—

The toil
Of dropping buckets into empty wells,
And growing old in drawing nothing up.

All this might have been "saved" had he sooner made the "valuable find." What a pity his common sense did not suggest to him, in the beginning, the propriety and prudence of consulting Catholic authorities for Catholic doctrine, instead of relying on Pusey, Littledale, and the anonymous scribblings of "Janus" and "Quirinus." He might thereby have saved what is more important than "trouble and space," namely, a remnant, even though ragged, of credit for ordinary intelligence. In the sphere of purely human science, conduct similar to the Vicar's in this respect would be regarded only as evidence of imbecility, for in *that* region idiots do not give the law to experts. But the less a man, especially a self-styled "Priest," knows about the Catholic religion, theoretical or practical, the better qualified he is to discuss it, and the more peremptory are his judgments. I have said the Vicar *might have saved* something by sooner consulting his Jesuit authority. A delusion! Even his "valuable find," now that he has it, exhibits him in the last stages of mental decrepitude. It is indeed a cruel Nemesis. It reminds me of a big dunce in a class at the blackboard doing a sum in simple addition. He adds up the figures written on the board, say, $3+4+2+6$

—and writing down as the result of the operation, 20, exclaims with a flourish of triumph in his voice: *Twenty!* while all the rest of the class very plainly see that the result is 15, *not* 20. I ask your readers to be the class for the nonce, whilst the Oxford theological acrobat and contortionist evolves his exegesis of his Jesuit friend. Here is the Vicar's translation in full from Schouppe:

"The Lord God said unto the serpent, 'I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; *she* shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.' Now that matchless (praeclara) woman is the same of whom Isaiah prophesies, 'Behold, a Virgin shall conceive'; the same of whom St. Paul writes in Gal. iv. 4, 'God sent forth His Son made of a woman'; the same of whom St. Luke records, 'The angel Gabriel was sent to a Virgin.' Furthermore the *enmities* which God foretold He would place between this woman united with her Son and the serpent, show not only that in Mary would be nothing in common with the devil and his works, that is sin, but everything which would be most opposed and contrary to them, that is sin; whence it follows that she would be pure from every stain, and moreover very full of sanctity and grace." The athlete bows for applause. . . . Let the performance proceed. Now comes the Vicar's comment on his "find," as follows:

"Here, then, we have an *authorized* exposition of the Scripture proof in which *Ipsa* is clearly the fulcrum of the whole position. The comment *on inimicitias* would be utterly meaningless were the second part of the text omitted or the *Ipsa* changed to *Ipse*. It is because the woman appears (by the corrupt reading) as the champion of the human race against Satan that Romanists argue her freedom from every consequence of his polluting touch. It is true, Schouppe adds, 'united with her Son,' but that is only a make-weight, since the position of Christ in the corrupted text is altogether insignificant. *He does not appear in it as the source of power for the conflict, nor even in personal form.*"

There is something so inexpressibly sad in this poor man's stupidity, that I *almost* feel towards him a pity which masters

indignation, and puts severity to flight. But I would be wanting in courtesy did I fail to show my appreciation, at all events, of his labors on behalf of the "poor Irish" of "this diocese." Therefore I remark that the Vicar's above comment surely exhibits him in the very apogee of imbecility. As your readers are aware it has not been my object in this controversy, it is not my intention now, to discuss and prove the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. My aim throughout has been, so far as it lay in my power, to correct the wretched and disgraceful mistakes of Bishop Kingdon and his Vicar, and so assist minds in their communion that are honestly and earnestly seeking after truth amid its Babel of doctrines. Father Schouppe, on the contrary, in the extract from him given by the Vicar, *is discussing* the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. As an argument from Scripture he cites Gen. iii. 15—and he quotes both clauses of it. Now, I have repeatedly explained the Catholic sense of the second clause as it stands in the Vulgate and Douay Bibles, and pointed out that, as regards the doctrinal meaning, it makes no difference whether we adopt *Ipse*, *Ipsa*, or *Ipsum*. I also proved from great Catholic theologians that neither Marian doctrine generally, nor the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception owes anything whatever to the last clause of the Protevangel; and much less did they owe to the present reading of the Vulgate. Catholic devotion here was simply the response which was made by the heart of the faithful, under the inspiration of God's grace, to the Church's teaching concerning the excellence and prerogatives of Mary—"our tainted nature's solitary boast," as even the Protestant poet could call her. It is, in very truth, one of the marvellous works of the Holy Ghost, Whose office it is "to lead the church step by step into all truth." St. John xvi. 13.

But Catholic theologians do affirm, on the other hand, that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was implicitly revealed in that *first clause* of the Protevangel, wherein God says,—*'I will put enmities between thee and the Woman.'* For, in the first place, it is evident, as I have before remarked, that the woman referred to can be no other than the mother of Jesus, the second Eve, as the Fathers from the earliest times call her.

She is plainly enough *the Woman of the Restoration*. And our Blessed Lord would seem to have had this in His mind, when He calls her by that name, especially on that solemn occasion on which He appointed her from His cross to be the Mother of all His elect. Whilst the redeeming Blood of the dying Saviour is trickling down from the Tree of Life in the middle of the New Paradise, Calvary, and the serpent's head is being crushed beneath it, the Woman with whom the serpent is at enmity, receives her office,—*Woman, behold thy Son ! Son, behold thy Mother*, and Mary then becomes the Mother of all who had been purchased to the New Life. Therefore does the dying Jesus call her Woman, *the Woman*, the enemy of the serpent. Again : it is equally evident, that the Divine Mercy is announcing in this *first clause* an enmity between Mary and the serpent. which should not be the result of her perseverance under the comforting influence of grace, but rather the product of His own absolute will. For He says : ‘I will put’;—the work shall be Mine. I will ordain it from the beginning. “You,”—we may suppose God to say, addressing the serpent,—“have deceived the first woman, and made of her an instrument, whereby to procure the ruin of man. That same creature, which has been the cause of your triumph, shall, to your more signal confusion, become the cause also of your ignominious defeat. And to this end I will see to it that you shall never have either part or lot in *the Woman of Promise*. My sanctifying grace shall build a wall round about her soul, which shall separate her from you forever. Eve was the beginning of death ; Mary shall be the beginning of the world's resurrection. You shall never boast that she has for a moment been polluted with the mark of your present victory. I will put an everlasting enmity between you : for I purpose to bestow on her an Immaculate Conception.” Such is the contention of Catholic Theologians.¹

Now the Vicar's astounding “find” confirms all this. For, what have I just been doing ? Simply expanding somewhat Father Schouppe's “exposition” of the *first clause* of our text—

¹ See Father Harper, l. c.

his comment on *enmities* as a proof of the truth of the Immaculate Conception. He quotes the verse from Genesis in full, but, because the second clause in its Catholic sense is absolutely irrelevant to his argument, he utterly ignores it and does not refer to it directly or indirectly. It is simply pointless as regards the Immaculate Conception, and Jesuit theologians are altogether *too jesuitical* to use that sort of proof. And yet the Vicar says: "*Ipsa* is clearly the fulcrum of the whole position." Why should I be angry with him? Let me but say to him, with genuine pity, as Saint Augustine once said: "May God teach you the things which you *think* you know." "It is true," he says, "that Schouppe adds 'united with her Son,' but that is only a make-weight, since the position of Christ in the corrupted text is altogether insignificant. He does not appear in it as the source of power for the conflict, not even in *personal* form." Good God! The words of the Eternal Father Himself, at the most momentous crisis in the history of the human race, characterized as a "make-weight"! And this by a man who claims a part in the priesthood of the Bride of Christ, the Incarnate God, whose coming is so clearly foreshadowed in *these* words! What blasphemy! Why, Schouppe "*adds*" nothing at all. The *union* of the woman with her Son is the very work of God in the announcement of man's redemption. His first promise of a Redeemer was imbedded (so to speak) in His promise of a Co-Redemptress. Look at the text: 'I will put enmities between thee and *the* Woman, *and* thy seed *AND* her seed.' What can be clearer and more simple of comprehension? Two parties are mentioned by God, between whom He will place irreconcilable "enmities"; these are the respective parties of evil and good; they who fight under the respective banners of Satan and of God. The one party, receiving its name in the prophecy from Satan, includes all evil angels and evil men. The other party, receiving its name in the prophecy from Mary—*the* woman, includes, firstly, the Incarnate God; and secondly, all good angels and good men.

I am not discussing the Immaculate Conception now, and have therefore drawn out but a small part of the full purport

and extraordinary significance of this *first clause*; but in view of my remarks what *can* your readers say of the blasphemous length to which the Vicar has carried his impertinence in his "make-weight" quotation? But worse. He actually dares to sit in judgment upon, and to criticise, the *manner* in which Almighty God, in this clause, has chosen to indicate "the position of Christ" in the scheme of man's salvation! He says that "position" is "insignificant," and complains that Christ "does not appear . . . as the source of power for the conflict, nor even in personal form!" I forbear comment; but did I speak too strongly when I expressed my belief that "he would deny the genuineness of the Holy Scriptures themselves to get himself out of the miserable scrape his pitiable vanity led him into"?

In this connection and while I am dealing with the first clause of our text I must give your readers another illustration of the Vicar's cowardly and malicious dishonesty—it cannot be stark ignorance. In his famous letter "for the benefit of Biblical students" he quoted from a pamphlet of Canon Oakeley's the following words: "I now come to what we (Roman Catholics) regard as the *Scriptural germ* of every doctrine and the *legitimate ground* of every authorized devotion on the subject of the Blessed Virgin. I mean the prediction of the office in the Christian Dispensation uttered by Almighty God at the time of the Fall" (viz., Gen. iii. 15). These words he tried to twist into an argument against me. In the last installment of my *Résumé* I very clearly pointed out that Oakeley's statement referred entirely to the first clause; and I proved that it was Mary's office in the "Christian Dispensation" as Mother of our Redeemer and Saviour, in His Sacred Humanity, that was predicted in the utterance of Almighty God. I showed that neither *Ipse*, *Ipsa*, nor *Ipsum*, as your readers now well know, had anything whatever to do with this, and that Oakeley built nothing on them. I also said: "I challenge this Vicar, then, to produce his proof to the contrary, if he has it, and from the pamphlet, or stand before this community *branded* as the prince of garblers and tergiversators." How does he meet me? He simply repeats, in his third "stricture," his cowardly slander,

and in a worse form. Here are his words: "We have already seen it admitted by that extreme Ultramontane, Canon Oakeley that Gen. iii. 15 (*of course in its corrupt form*)—see that, my readers—'is the *Scriptural germ* of every doctrine and the *legitimate ground* of every authorized devotion on the Blessed Virgin.'" That is, he cannot accept my challenge, but elects the alternative of the *brand* instead. That is proper and becoming. The same line of thought applies to my quotation from Hurter's Dogmatic Theology and the Vicar's "stricture" on it. Your readers can examine them.

I need not remind thoughtful students that it is only a *posteriori*—from the fact that we live in the full blaze of the light of the Incarnation with its concomitant mercies, and revel in the glorious liberty of the children of God purchased for us by the passion and death of the "Seed of the Woman," Mary's Son—that we can catch the full significance of that first gleam of light which relieved the darkness of Man's Fall: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; She (he or it) shall crush thy head." How clear its meaning to the Catholic mind! Permit me a word more on the *second clause*. In its primary sense, it refers to Christ, the Incarnate God, whom we met in the first clause, and without whom we can do nothing. In its secondary sense, ancient and modern witnesses to Catholic doctrine use it to illustrate and to accentuate our victory over Satan by and through Christ. Thus we have seen St. Augustine use it in his sermon on Saints Perpetua and Felicitas, and he also applies it to the Church. So St. Paul, as we have seen, uses it—Romans xvi. 20, and the Bishops and Catholic writers of to-day quoted from Pusey. I trust the Vicar has now learned something about it in *both* senses which he will not soon forget.

In closing his comments on the quotation from Schouppe the Vicar innocently says: "I may now, thereupon, fairly hand over my opponent to his own Schouppe backed by Pius IX., expressing the hope, however, that he will not speak of his contention with them as a theological *chore*, or they might deem him rude and perhaps the church he represents so ably in this city might in that case have a word to say to

him." I am sure I have cause to thank the Vicar very heartily for his solicitude that I should be in good company. As a "priest," you know, he is not indifferent to its influence on a man's mind and morals. But, if I may so speak, Pius IX., of immortal memory, the Pontiff of the Immaculate Conception, and Father Schouppe are old friends of mine; and I can assure the Vicar that my "contention" in their company has been a simple delight. I would not use the word "*chore*" now—its bouquet is not sufficiently exquisite to be used in connection with two such names. I feel it would be positively "rude." The Vicar is right—he *is* such a veritable æsthete in such matters! But then he speaks of the church which he says I "represent so ably in this city." "Ay, there's the rub!" Who could withstand that appeal? He knows, none better, how near vanity is to being "the last infirmity of noble minds." Let me then generously answer his appeal by commending him in turn to Schouppe's theology. In a P.S. to his "Strictures" he referred to an article in the *Quarterly Review*, written, I do not hesitate to say, by Littledale. It is characteristically full of false and silly statements. But there is one so ludicrously consonant with strict truth and so in line with my remarks that I give it as follows:

"The English student of theology, who happens to light for the first time upon a Roman Catholic theological text-book, is apt to be struck by its lucid arrangement, its incisive, unflinching statements, contrasting *not a little* with some of the books his own teachers recommend to him."

Just so. The Vicar will find Schouppe such a book. He will not find it like the one he read to pass his examination for "Orders"—a ridiculous admixture of everything almost *except* theology and philosophy. Let him read Schouppe, not for controversy with Rome, for which he is so utterly unfitted and unprepared, not as water is poured upon sand, but as it is poured upon the roots of a tree, to be absorbed and incorporated into real knowledge. Dr. Johnson says that "much may be made of a Scotchman if he be caught young," perhaps because my Celtic brethren are Irishmen by descent. It has fallen to the luck of the Vicar to be "caught young," and in

the first flush of his zeal to keep the obligations of his "priestly vow." If he but act upon my *friendly* advice now, he will find his studies open a vista through the entangled contradictions of Anglo-ritualist theology, furnish him with some theological perspective, and stretch his mind to such a degree that the light of common sense at least will shine through and save him from repeating the exhibition your readers have witnessed in the "Strictures."

I thought I was through with this subject, but he asks your readers' "attention to an interpretation of *Ipsa*," which, he says, is "new" to him. Well, it ought not to be "new" to *him*, for it is the pure creation of his own muddled, opaque, and bedismalled brain. O it is rich! Let us look at it. He quotes from a "Pictorial Church History" as follows: "She (the seed of the woman) shall crush thy (the serpent's) head, &c." And he remarks upon it thus: "Mary then is now to be considered by the rising generation as the *Promised Seed*. *Eve* the woman and Mary the seed alone appear in the text. . . . It banishes all reference to the Messiah, and the text . . . ceases to be . . . the first announcement of the Gospel." Ha! ha!! ha!!! O will not some of his friends even now look after this man! *Fenum habet in cornu*. Verily we have a new interpretation. It is a pity, a thousand pities, to spoil it. But where does Mary appear as the "Promised Seed"? And where does "*Eve* the woman" appear at all? Of course—*nowhere*! What is the difference between "She (the seed of the woman) shall crush thy head," and "she (he or it) shall crush thy head"? Surely there is not a particle of difference. The words in brackets in both citations are the absolute equivalents of each other. How could such stuff get into his head? What *is* his malady? The beauty and truth of the illustration to which he also refers—"Judith encircled by this text"—would only be sullied by another word. I desist.

Just here he slips in a reference to the "edge-tool from De Rossi." He "forgot to say" that he "searched for it in vain," and he "wonders what it was." Long before this his *wonder* has given place to very different emotions. I hope he enjoys

them. "I know of a capital mare's nest in Pusey's quotation about *Ipsum*," he says. What! Why did he suppress it then, in his letter last December, written "for the benefit of Biblical students," when he quoted from De Rossi's work on "The Various Readings of the Old Testament"? Worse than that. Why did he say in the 16th paragraph of his second "stricture": "In all the commentaries I have read on Gen. iii. 15, I have never found *Ipsum* mentioned as a various reading and that therefore I doubt if one exists"? He has probably suffered enough for his sin in this particular. I therefore hand him over to the tender mercies of your readers, only reminding them in the words of the Talmud, that "There is a great difference between one who can feel ashamed before his own soul, and one who is only ashamed before his fellow-men."

"I have now," he says, "concluded all the necessary arguments. . . . I have still a few words to say outside the main contention." To a consideration of these "few words" I will invite the attention of your readers in my next.

LETTER XV.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I have now disposed of *Iipse*, *Iipsa*, *Iipsum* in their strict relation to this discussion, and my labors were at an end had my opponent adhered to the points at issue when we began it. Instead, however, he has swept the gamut of misrepresentation and calumny on a topic selected by himself, namely, the position of the Blessed Virgin in Catholic theology. The one aspect in which, throughout his dreary "Strictures," he represents his Saviour's dearest Mother, is as the object of an anti-Christian worship, and as the most formidable antagonist to her Son's due honor. This is their most repulsive characteristic. He is one of the tribe, as flourishing now as in the days

of Aristophanes, whose occupation it is "to make the worse appear the better reason." In the "Strictures" he appears at his best—or worst. They are simply instinct with passion, prejudice, and malevolence. Beginning with his very first letter and thence continuously to the end, he hurls at Catholics and the Catholic Church such opprobrious terms as "Idolatry," "Apostasy," "Impiety," and "Infidelity." Surely these are the most frightful charges that can be laid to the score of any Christian! For, throughout God's Word, the crime of idolatry is spoken of as the most heinous, the most odious and the most detestable in His eyes, even in an individual. What must it be then, when flung as an accusation upon millions who have been baptized in the name of Christ, who have tasted the sacred gift of the Holy Eucharist, and received the Holy Ghost; and of whom, therefore, if guilty of this crime, St. Paul tells us (Heb. vi. 6), that it is impossible that they be renewed unto penance?

But what is idolatry? It is the giving to man, or to anything created, that homage, that adoration, and that worship, which God has reserved for Himself; and to substantiate such a charge against us, it must be proved that such honor and worship is taken by us from God and given to a creature. My opponent has in the presence of the God of truth (if he was conscious of such), and our fellow-citizens taken the awful responsibility of imputing this crime to us, and he appeals for proof to the language we use in expressing our love for, and veneration of, the holiest creature that ever came from the hands of the Creator, creation's masterpiece, its crown and glory—Mary of Nazareth.

I have before me while I write a copy of Raphael's famous painting, the "Madonna di San Sisto." There stands "the transfigured woman," as Mrs. Jameson finely says, "at once completely woman and something more; an abstraction of power and purity and love, poised on the empurpled air, requiring no other support, and looking out with her melancholy, loving mouth, her slightly-dilated, sibylline eyes, quite through the universe to the end and consummation of all things."

**There is a listening fear in her regard,
As if calamity had but begun;**

As if the vanward clouds of evil days
 Had spent their malice, and the sullen rear
 Was with its stored thunder laboring up.

In presence of this conception of surpassing loveliness and majesty, and in the gaze of the immortal eyes of the Divine Child enthroned upon her heart, I pledge myself to encounter squarely and fully the infamous calumny of the Vicar, to steadily confront his so-called proof, and so far as reason can, to tear away utterly and entirely the veil of prejudice that has been hanging, alas! too long, between the eyes of Protestants and the claims upon their veneration of the Mother of their Redeemer. I promise that of his argument I will "leave not a rack behind"—and to a large extent I will use Pusey and other Anglican authorities. I ask the thoughtful attention of your dissenting Protestant readers. I blush at the thought of my unworthiness to be the apologist of those claims, and I regret that by the exigencies of the moment

The lyre so long divine
 Degenerates into hands like mine.

Truth, however, is objective and altogether independent of my personal demerits. Besides, I claim a share in that sonship declared at the foot of the Cross—*Woman, behold thy Son! Son, behold thy Mother*—and I am summoned to a discharge of its duties by the Vicar's challenge. If I regarded only the influence his words may have on the Catholic mind nothing further need be said in reply to them. It would be but breaking "a fly upon the wheel." Before that ineffably awful and winning doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ with His Church, the living, loving Incarnate God tabernacled with men, the notion that any reverence to those in whose bodies He had dwelt, any love to her whose milk He had deigned to drink, could lessen by a hair's breadth the immeasurable distance between the Creator and the creature, is so unspeakably absurd that it vanishes out of its presence as an impure fog generated by human malice and weakness. My opponent's "supply of useful information," then, from "Liguori" and "the Raccolta"

in his first letter, and his "wider view of the Roman Cultus of Mary," from Pusey, in his last, are for the benefit of his fellow-Protestants. Of course, he disowns and disclaims any such fellowship, for he is a "true Catholic," but as he can be "all things to all men" to score a point against Rome, I trust my "dissenting" Protestant friends will not feel aggrieved or insulted at my associating him with them in this connection. What though as a ritualistic "Priest" he has "popish tendencies"? Does he not

Compound for sins he is inclined to,
By damning those he has no mind to,

when he holds up for their execration the soul-destroying idolatry of the "Roman Cultus of Mary"? This he has done for Protestants, and I propose to answer him for Protestants.

In Theology, as in Philosophy, in order to understand any specific doctrine, it is necessary, first to have mastered, at least in the way of clear apprehension, the great main idea which constitutes its intellectual basis. Now, without going deeply into questions of doctrine, for which this is not the place, what, let me ask, is the dogmatic teaching of the Catholic Church with regard to the Saints? We find it embodied in the solemn declarations of her highest tribunal. The Council of Trent "Enjoins upon all Bishops and others having the charge of teaching that, according to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and according to the consent of the holy Fathers, and the decrees of sacred Councils" the faithful be taught that "The Saints, reigning with Christ, offer up their prayers to God, for men; that it is *good and useful* suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, help and assistance, in order to obtain favor from God through His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour." The Catholic doctrine regarding the Saints is, therefore, two-fold. In the first place, that the Saints of God make intercession before Him for their brethren on earth; and, in the second place, that it is lawful to invoke their intercession.

The setting up of the Saints by the Church, as patterns for religious and moral imitation, connected with the doctrine of their intercession in our behalf with God, and of the corresponding invocation of their aid on our part, constitutes the *principle* of the veneration of Saints, which is in the same way related to the supreme worship of God, as the mutual relation existing between creatures is to the state of dependence of them all on their common Creator and Lord. Virtuous creatures look with love and reverence on those of their body who were eminently endowed by God, and, in virtue of the love implanted within them, they wish each other all good, and lift up their hands in each other's behalf to God, who, rejoicing in the love that emanates from Himself and binds His creatures together, hears their mutual supplications, in case they be worthy of His favor, and out of the fulness of His power satisfies them—and this no creature is able to accomplish. Besides, if we are to worship Christ, we are forced to venerate His Saints. Their brightness is nothing but an irradiation from the glory of Christ, and a proof of His infinite power, because out of dust and sin He is able to raise up eternal spirits of light. The Christian, therefore, who reveres God's Saints glorifies Christ from whose power and grace they have sprung and whose true Divinity they attest. Hence the Catholic Church, while commemorating, in her Liturgies and Offices during the year, the great events in the life of our Divine Lord, encircles them with the feasts of the Saints who, throughout the history of the Church, testify to the effects in this world of the coming of our Redeemer, of His ministry and His sufferings, His resurrection and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. So that in the lives of the Saints, the effects of the life of Christ, and its fruits, are brought home at once to the contemplation and feelings of every Catholic. Here let me remind your readers that the doctrine of the Church does not declare that the Saints *must*, but only that they *can*, be invoked; since the Council of Trent, already quoted, says only that “it is *good and useful* suppliantly to invoke their intercession.” Of faith in the Divinity of Christ, and in His mediatorial office, or in His sanctifying grace, and the like, the Church by no means

teaches that it is merely "good and useful," but that it is *absolutely necessary to salvation*.

So far I think your Protestant readers will find no evidence of idolatry. As I am not discussing doctrine here so much as explaining, I may be permitted to contrast our position with theirs in this particular. They concede that the lives of the Saints are worthy of imitation, and that they should be honored by our imitation. They even admit (in their Symbols now before me) that the Saints pray for the Church at large, but they assert that the saints must not be prayed to for their intercession. The reason they adduce is that Christ is our only mediator! Let me examine shortly the coherency of these ideas. Is it not passing strange that the saints should pray to God for us without apprehending that they encroach on the mediatorial office of Christ? And that God, the Father, and Christ should even permit these, their functions, in our behalf, and accordingly find them free from all presumption—and yet that we, on our part, should not ask the exercise of these kindly offices, because our prayer would involve an offence, whereas the thing prayed for involves none? But the prayers of the saints must surely be wrong, if our requests for such prayers be wrong. But if their supplications in our behalf be laudable and pleasing to God, why should not our prayers for such supplications be so too? To me it is clear that the consciousness of their active intercession, admitted by Protestants, necessarily determines an affirmation of the same on our part, and excites a joy which, when we analyze it, already includes the interior wish and prayer for their intercession. For all communion is mutual, and to the exertions of one side the counter-exertions of the other must correspond, and *vice versa*. Surely an indifference to the intercession of the Saints would annihilate it and completely destroy all communion existing between the two forms of the one Church—triumphant and militant. But if it be impossible for us to be indifferent in this matter, then the doctrine of the Catholic Church remains the reasonable and true doctrine.

Again: The intercession of the saints, as well as the corresponding invocation of that intercession on our part, is so far

from impairing the merits of Christ, that it is merely an effect of the same—a fruit of His all-atoning power that again united heaven and earth. This our ecclesiastical prayers very beautifully and strikingly express; for they all without exception, even when we petition the Saints, are addressed in our Redeemer's name. Moreover, if the intercession of the Saints interfere with the mediatorial office of Christ, then must all intercession, and prayer for intercession, even among the living, be absolutely rejected, which is absurd. Christ alone redeemed us, and by communion with Him, all glorified through Him, partake as well in His righteousness as in all things connected therewith—*hence* the power of their intercession, and hence also the right of asking for that intercession from the living, as well as from the departed just. This is the doctrine familiar to every Catholic child. (Moehler, *Symbolism*.)

Let me explain still a little further the *rationale* of Catholic veneration of the saints. We do not ask the saints to pray for us because we cannot pray directly to God for ourselves, or because we feel that they love us better than our dear Lord and Redeemer. It is not because they have a greater, a more tender, sympathy with us, or are more ready to help us, that we pray to the saints, and ask them to intercede with our Divine Mediator for us, or to bear for us our petitions to the throne of grace, for our Lord is perfect man as well as perfect God, and God himself is the fountain of all love, mercy, tenderness, and compassion to which we appeal in the saints. The reason is THE MEDIATORIAL CHARACTER OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD. The principle of the order founded by the Incarnation of the Word is the deification of the creature, to make the creature one with the Creator, so that the creature may participate in the divine life, which is love, and in the divine blessedness, the eternal and infinite blessedness of the Holy and Ineffable Trinity, the one ever-living God. I find this idea in that glorious saying put forth by the greatest of the Eastern, as by the greatest of the Western Fathers, “that God became man in order that man might become God—*Factus est Deus homo ut homo fieret Deus*”: St. Athanasius and St. Augustine. Creation itself has no other purpose or end; as the Incarnation

of the Word, and the whole Christian order, are designed by the divine economy simply as the means to this end, which is indeed realized or consummated in Christ the Lord, at once perfect God and perfect man, united indissolubly in one divine person.

The design of the Christian order is, through regeneration by the Holy Ghost, to unite every individual man to Christ, and to make all believers one with one another, and one with Him as He is one with the Father. All who are thus regenerated and united are united to God, made one with Him, live in His life, and participate in His infinite, eternal, and ineffable bliss. Creation is but a manifestation of the goodness of the Creator; and as the purpose of God in creating was to give to creatures a share in His own infinite life and blessedness, He must be infinitely more loving, tender, and compassionate than any creature, however exalted or glorified. It is from Him that the glorified saints and angels draw whatever of love, tenderness, or compassion we appeal to in them.

Again: God not only permits the glorified creature to participate in His own life, love and beatitude, but He also permits His creatures to be co-workers with Him in His work, and to participate in the glory of its accomplishment. He makes, in some sense, the creature a medium of effecting its perfection; that is, He uses created agents and ministers in effecting His purpose, and in gaining the end for which He creates them and thus enables them to gain the signal honor of sharing in the glory of the Creator's and the Redeemer's work, that is, in the glory of the Kingdom of God. Hence it is that the true followers of Christ enter into glory with Him, or participate in the glory of His Kingdom—this they could not do if they had done nothing toward founding and advancing it. It is not that He needs them for Himself; but because, in His superabounding goodness, He would bestow on them the honor and blessedness of sharing in His work, and of being, so to speak, employed in His service, and meriting His approbation and reward. It is His love to His saints, His friends, that leads Him to employ them in His service, that gives them the high honor of being *intercessors for us*. They are filled with His

love, and like Him, overflow with love and goodness to all His creatures. Our veneration of, and devotion to, the saints flows naturally, so to say, from the principle of the Incarnation—the *deification of man or the creature*; and in it we not only honor the saints, but manifest our faith in the superabounding love and goodness of God, which permits them to work with Him for the fulfillment of His design in creation, and to share in its glory.

The fact, that God does employ the saints and angels as agents and ministers in carrying on His mediatorial work, is indisputable. If anything is clear and certain from the Holy Scriptures, it is this. I do not intend to argue here. It is implied in the very fact of the Incarnation, which makes the creature one with the Creator. It is only the universal extension of the sacerdotal principle which underlies all religion, and cannot be denied without denying the very principle of the Christian order. Even Protestants, when they send a note to their minister asking him to pray, and the congregation to pray, for a sick or dying friend, or for a family, or an individual in great affliction, recognize, whether they know it or not, the sacerdotal principle,—the very principle on which rests the invocation of saints. We can, of course, ask God directly for whatever we think we have need of; but when we ask also the saints to ask Him for us, we act in accordance with His love for them, and unite with Him in honoring them, by engaging them in working out His designs. We honor God in honoring with our love and confidence those whom He delights to love and honor; and in invoking their prayers, we enlist, in aid of our own prayers, the prayers of those whose sanctity renders them dear to our Lord and God. The pretence of Protestants, that, in honoring the Saints, we are robbing God of the honor that is His due, and putting the creature in the place of the Creator, shows, if not absolute want of faith in Christ, an absolute ignorance of the Christian system or the theological principles revealed in the Holy Scriptures. It overlooks the mediatorial character of the Gospel, and the fact that all in the Gospel grows out of the Incarnation of the Word, who was with God in the beginning, and is God. Their doubts or difficulties on

this subject originate in their rejection or ignorance of the Incarnation, and their never having considered the Christian system as a whole. The heathen retained the primitive revelation, but only in a broken and piecemeal state. Protestants do the same with the Christian revelation as preserved and taught by the Catholic Church. They have lost the perception of the relation of the several parts to the whole, and fail to recognize their inter-dependence and strict logical consistency one with another, and with the whole, of which they are integral parts.

Cardinal Newman both sums up our doctrine on this head, and answers the, to me ever unintelligible, objection of Protestants, in these words: "Only this I know full well now, and did not know then (that is, before his *reversion* to the Church of his forefathers), that the Catholic Church allows no image of any sort, material or immaterial, no dogmatic symbol, no rite, no sacrament, no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself, to come between the soul and its Creator. It is face to face, '*solus cum solo*,' in all matters between man and his God. He alone creates; He alone has redeemed; before His awful eyes we go in death; in the vision of Him is our eternal beatitude. . . . The command practically enforced (is), 'My son, give Me thy heart.' The devotions then to angels and saints as little interfere with the incommunicable glory of the Eternal, as the love which we bear our friends and relations, our tender human sympathies, are inconsistent with that supreme homage of the heart to the Unseen which really does but sanctify and exalt what is of earth."

So much for the Catholic view of our doctrine on the veneration of the Saints. I do not think your candid readers will find *much* "idolatry" in it. But as I like to agree with my adversary in the way when it is possible, I will summon some Anglican witnesses in support of the orthodoxy of this view.

Bishop Latimer (*apud* Foxe) writes as follows:

"Take Saints for inhabitants of heaven, and worshipping of them for praying to them, I never denied but they might be worshipped, and be our mediators, though not by way of redemption (for so Christ alone is a whole mediator, both for them and for us), yet by way of intercession."

I ought to apologize to Littledale's disciple for calling this witness, since Littledale says he was one of those "miscreants" and "utterly unredeemed villains" who "did not break and shatter (the Church of England) so completely as to prevent honest men from repairing it." How delighted Anglicans in "this diocese" must be to know they have one of those "honest men" among them! The Church was "going to the dogs" before he came, but now, of course, its "dry bones will live again." I ask your readers to note for the present the word "*worshipped*" in the above quotation.

Bishop Montague writes as follows:

"I see no absurdity in nature, no incongruity unto analogy of faith, no repugnancy at all to sacred Scripture, much less impiety, for any man to say, '*O sancte angelo custos, ora pro me*' (O holy angel guardian, pray for me)." In like manner he defends the Virgin Justina mentioned by St. Gregory Nazianzen, as imploring the help of the Blessed Virgin, and says that "against such a manner of invoking saints, joined with faith in Christ, he would not contend."—Forbes, "*Consid. Modest.*," p. 327.

Thorndyke writes thus: "The second kind of invocations is the '*ora pro nobis*' (pray for us) and the '*te rogamus audi nos*' (we beseech thee, hear us) directly addressed to the Blessed Virgin and the saints." Of this kind he pronounces that "*it is not idolatry*"; and that the greatest "lights of the Greek and Latin Church, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, both the Cyrils, Theodoret, Fulgentius, Gregory the Great, and Leo, &c., who lived from the time of Constantine, have all of them spoken to the saints departed and desired their assistance."

Again: Forbes, Bishop of Edinburgh, has exhausted the whole subject in his book entitled "*Considerationes Modestae*," &c. The third chapter of his treatise is devoted to prove the following proposition:

"The mere invocation or addressing of Angels and Saints, asking them to join us in praying, and to intercede for us to God, is neither to be condemned as unlawful, nor as useless," p. 229. And before bringing an overwhelming mass of testimony from Protestants themselves, he concludes thus:

"In fine, for very many ages now past, throughout the Universal Church, in the East no less than in the West, and in the North also among the Muscovites, it is a received usage to sing '*St. Peter, etc., pray for us*'; but to despise or condemn the universal consent of the whole church is most dangerous presumption," p. 322.

The same Bishop, among other admissions of later times, quotes with approbation the following from a book entitled "*Pia et Catholica Christiani Hominis Institutio*," in English and Latin, put forth by the Bishops of the Church of England in the year 1537, and afterwards again in the year 1543 (the Latin in 1544), and never hitherto retracted or condemned:

"To pray unto Saints to be intercessors with us and for us to our Lord in our suits which we make unto Him, and for such things as we can obtain of none but Him, so that we esteem not, or worship not them as givers of those gifts, but as intercessors for the same, is received and approved by the most ancient and perpetual use of the Catholic Church; but if we honor them any other ways than as the friends of God, dwelling with Him, and established now in His glory everlasting, and as examples which were requisite for us to follow in holy life and conversation, or if we yield unto Saints the adoration and honor which is due unto God alone, we do, no doubt, break the commandment."

This is the Catholic doctrine pure and simple—the doctrine of the Council of Trent, and it will suffice to say that Pusey endorses every word of it and accepts the teaching of the Council. See "*Eirenicon*," vol. 1, pp. 100, 101; vol. 2, pp. 34-5, 41, &c. These witnesses, one and all, accept and proclaim as true the simple lessons of "the catechisms of Butler and Milner adopted by the Bishop of St. John for this diocese," on which the Vicar so magisterially, and withal *so graciously* puts his *Imprimatur*.

Now let the unsophisticated Anglican "of these parts" turn to Article XXII. of the famous Thirty-nine and read as follows:

"The Romish doctrine concerning . . . invocation of Saints is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

His old-fashioned associations and ideas must receive a rude shock, and his feelings be those of a veritable Rip Van Winkle as he looks into the faces of his teachers who blandly assure him, in the words quoted above: *Nous avons changé tout cela!* However, he has some compensation in knowing that he belongs to a *progressive* church. The Lambeth Conference now assures him that the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion are no longer in their entirety to be binding as a condition of "complete intercommunion" with the Church of England. I hope the Vicar will look after his "Old Catholic" friends in Wisconsin now, and see to it that they get the benefit of this measure of grace from Lambeth. Perhaps, however, he still adheres to the ritualistic view of the Episcopate expressed by Froude. This ex-Anglican deacon puts it thus:

"The latest and most singular theory about them (the Anglican Bishops) is that of the modern English Neo-Catholic who disregards his Bishop's advice and despises his censures, but looks on him nevertheless as some high-bred worn-out animal, useless in himself, but infinitely valuable for some mysterious purpose of spiritual propagation."

Thus far I have confined myself to a simple statement of the Catholic doctrine on the veneration of the saints, as I learned it at my mother's knee, and the principles which underlie it. In my next I will apply these principles to the interpretation of those facts, touching the "Queen of Saints," massed by the Vicar from "Liguori," the "Raccolta," and Pusey. Your readers will then be able, once and forever I hope, to give these facts their due value.

LETTER XVI.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—In my last letter I did but suggest the great positive principles and moral ideas which are the vertebration, so to

speaking, of our doctrine on the veneration and invocation of the saints. If I have made myself understood, I have shown why it is that we honor them, and why it is that God Himself, in fulfilling His design in creation, especially the "new creation" or the order founded by the Incarnation, uses the ministry of saints and angels, and chiefly, as their Queen, His Blessed Mother, from whose chaste body He took His human nature. I so spread it out to make it intelligible as well to non-cultured religious Protestant minds as to the *élite*, spiritually and intellectually, among them. Relying on the simple aspirations of the human heart *informed* with the Christian idea, however fragmentary, I hoped to bring home to many of them a realization of spiritual facts, which, however acknowledged as truths, hang in visionary distance like a far cloud on the horizon of their thought. Of course I am aware, from the miserable and wretched performances of the Vicar alone, which I am now considering, how utterly incapable they are to appreciate the full devotion of Catholic hearts to their Divine Lord. They cannot imagine or believe that there is an exquisite and all-sufficing happiness in the communion with our Saviour which compensates all sacrifices, lightens all burdens and transcends all the enjoyment that this world can offer—and, because, they know nothing of, or believe nothing in, that stupendous miracle of His love, His real presence in the holy and adorable Sacrament of the Altar. Bound, from their infancy, with the triple cord of *calumny*, wherein Protestantism has involved the Catholic Church, the gigantic framework of *prejudice* erected thereon, and which rises up and permeates the mind and heart of Protestants, ignorant and intelligent alike, and the whole developing into the power of *habit*, the mightiest over fallen man, the very truth which is most dear to them in the shape in which they have received it, ceases to be amiable in the Catholic Church, where it is most pure and perfect. Their writers and preachers and "Priests" (is it impious so to speak?) of "Mission Chapels" seem hardly to suspect that in outcast "Romanism" the love of Christ is incomparably stronger, the familiar consideration of His divine Sacrifice more frequent, the sense of His satisfaction for our sins more vivid, the appro-

priation of His transcendent merits more intimate and habitual, the reliance on Him *only* as the height and depth of our security more exclusive and more entire than among their multiplied and conflicting sects. The truth of these remarks is apparent every day and not always either in minds of dimensions so near a geometrical line that they cannot hold the Ten Commandments.

Now, as I have once remarked, we have no special *doctrine* respecting the veneration due to Mary of Nazareth. She is to be honored because *all* saints are to be honored, and for no other reason. She is to be honored *more* than other saints, because certain facts are revealed to us regarding her, both in Holy Scripture and by Tradition, from which we know that God would have us especially to honor her whom He has chosen to honor above all other Saints. In them there is a colored, refracted ray from His sanctity and holiness; in her there is a full-orbed glory, a paler reflex from Him who is the reflex of His Father. She is the very Queen of angels and saints, and, as the Mother of God, is exalted above every other creature, and is only below the Ineffable Trinity. Whom, then, should God more delight to honor, or more delight to have honored by us? She is the spouse of the Holy Ghost, she is the Mother of Christ, and nothing seems more in accordance with His love and goodness, and the very design of His mediatorial kingdom, as revealed in the Gospel, than that He should do her the honor of making her His chief agent in His work of love and mercy,—the medium through which He dispenses His favors to men. There is joy in heaven among the angels of God, we are told, over one sinner that repents. The Saints and Angels, filled with the Spirit of God, and in perfect concord with the divine purpose in creation, and with the Word in becoming Incarnate, are full of love to all the creatures of God, and join with Him into whose glory they have entered, in seeking the blessedness of those He has redeemed by His own Precious Blood. They take an interest in the salvation of souls, the repentance of sinners, and the growth and perfection of the regenerated, and consequently love their mission, and perform their task with their own good-will, and with joy and

alacrity. This love, this interest, this good-will, must be greatest in their Queen, the ever-blessed Mary. As she is exalted above every other creature, only God Himself can surpass her in His love for His creatures.

Why do Catholics claim so exalted a position for Mary? What is its foundation, the principles or reasons on which it rests? Let me consider them. This claim, I say, is authorized by her peculiar relation to the mystery of the Incarnation, therefore to our salvation, and the peculiar, special honor we render her is in honor of that mystery itself, that is in honor of God in His human as well as in His divine nature. Those who reject the Incarnation, such as *professed* Pelagians, Nestorians, Socinians, or Unitarians, can understand nothing of this honor, and have no lot or part in it; for they can neither worship God in His human nature, nor admit that He really assumed flesh from the flesh of Mary. To them Mary is only an ordinary woman, and holds *no* peculiar relation to the mystery of redemption. She has, in their view, nothing to do with our salvation, and is related to Christianity no otherwise than is any other woman. They assign her no peculiar position or office in the economy of God's gracious providence. They are offended when they hear us call her the Mother of God, and *wisely* sneer at us when they hear us address her as our own dear mother. I have nothing here to say to them and to such as they. The veneration of Mary presupposes the real Incarnation of our Lord in her chaste body, and her real and subsisting maternal relations to God *made man*, and they who shrink from it show by that fact that they do not really believe in that mystery, and therefore do not really embrace the Christian religion, and at best make only a hollow profession of it. Concede the Incarnation, and the Catholic veneration follows as a necessary consequence, because then Mary becomes truly the Mother of God. If you concede the Incarnation, you must concede that Mary is the Mother of God; if you deny that she is the Mother of God, you must deny the Incarnation. There is no middle course possible. If Mary is the Mother of her Son, then the relations between mother and Son and all that those relations imply subsist and must ever subsist between

them, and she must be honored as the Mother of God, and therefore of grace, the grace through which we are redeemed and saved.

Proof—In the Incarnation God assumes human nature, becomes man without ceasing to be God, and *so* assumes human nature that He becomes from the moment of the Incarnation as truly human as He is divine,—perfect man as well as perfect God. It is not that a perfect man is united to perfect God, but that perfect God becomes Himself really perfect man, in such sort that the human nature is as truly the nature of the Divine Person or word, as is the Divine nature itself. The two natures are united in *one person*, or the one person is the hypostasis or the one *suppositum* (as logicians say) of two distinct natures, one Divine, the other human. The tendency of Protestants, even of those who *profess* to hold the mystery of the Incarnation, is to regard the union, not as the union of two natures in one person, but as a simple moral union of two persons, one human, the other God, or the union of human nature in its own human personality with God, which is what the infamous Nestorius taught. Hence, Protestants have a tendency to '*dissolve*' Christ, and to cherish the spirit of what the Apostle calls Antichrist. But the true doctrine of the Incarnation, which we must admit, if we admit any real Incarnation at all, is, that the human and Divine natures are united, without being confounded, in one Divine Person. Person is *distinguishable*, but not *separable*, from nature, for no person is conceivable as really existing without a nature; and though human as well as Divine nature is distinguishable from person, yet neither is conceivable as really existing without person or personality. The human nature of Christ is not human nature divested of personality; it is a person as much as is the human nature of James or John, but its person is Divine, not human,—the eternal person of the Divine nature of Christ. Hence, Christ is *two* distinct natures in *one* person, which Divine Person is God, or the second person of the ever-adorable Trinity.

Now God in His human nature is *literally* and *truly* the Son of Mary, and she is as much His mother as any woman is

the mother of her own son. She is not the mother of a son united to God, of a human son received into union with God, for that were the error of the Adoptionists and would imply that the human nature of Christ has a human personality, which it has not and never had. Human nature cannot exist without a personality, and the human nature of Christ, therefore, was not and could not have been generated, without His Divine personality. Then that which was conceived in the womb of Mary and born of her was the Divine Person assuming to Himself flesh, or the nature of man, therefore God. Hence in the strictest sense of the word, Mary is the Mother of God, and therefore God is as truly her son as any one is the son of his own mother. Undoubtedly, Mary was not the mother of God in His Divine nature, that is, the mother of the Divinity, for in that sense God is eternal, necessary, and self-existent Being, and the Creator of Mary, not her Son; but God Incarnate is still God, and God having assumed flesh is no less God in His human nature than in His Divine nature. And therefore Mary is none the less the Mother of God because His mother only in His human nature, for the human nature of which she is the mother is the human nature of God. She is not the mother of the Divinity, but she is the mother of God, for since the Incarnation, God the Son is the *one person* of both Divine nature and human nature, and is as to nature at once God and man. *How* God can descend to be the person of human nature, or exalt human nature to be truly His own nature, is a mystery which transcends every created intelligence and which none but He Himself can fully comprehend. All we know or can pretend to know, is the fact that He has done so, and thus, although our Creator has become our *Brother*, flesh of our flesh, that we might be made partakers of His Divine nature, and live forever in a true society with Him. Such is our doctrine on the Incarnation as I have learned it and taught it to Catholic boys in day and Sunday school.

Now Mary, as the mother of God, is something more than an ordinary woman, and holds a place in the economy of grace different from that of any other woman, different from and above that of any other creature. She has been honored by

the Creator as no other creature has been, for she alone has been selected by Him to be His mother. If God has distinguished her from all other women, if He has chosen her to be His mother, shall not we distinguish her from all other women and honor her as His mother? What higher honor could God confer on a creature than He has conferred on Mary? Shall we not honor whom God Himself delights to honor, and like Him give her the highest honor that we can give to a creature? We are to love and honor the Son as we love and honor the Father, and we are to love and honor Him in His sacred Humanity no less than in His Divinity. We cannot dissolve Christ; for "Every spirit that dissolveth Jesus," says the blessed Apostle John, "is not of God; and this is that Antichrist of whom ye have heard that he cometh, and he is now already in the world" (1 John iv. 3). We cannot dissolve Christ and worship Him in His Divine nature only, and refuse to worship Him in His human nature. He is *one* Christ, not *two*,—one human, the other Divine. He is two forever distinct natures in one person, to be loved and honored alike in both natures, and therefore in her from whom He took His human nature. We cannot honor Him without honoring her, if we try, nor honor her as His mother without honoring Him. Such is the intimate relation between the Mother and the Son, that whatever honor we render her as His mother redounds to Him, and whatever honor we render to Him as her son—that is, to Him as come in the flesh—will overflow and extend to her. The two cannot be separated, for the flesh of the Son is of the flesh of the Mother, and both have one and the same nature, and impossible is it to honor the nature in the one without honoring it in the other. By this fact Mary becomes intimately connected with the mystery of our Redemption and final salvation. We are redeemed only by God, not in His Divine nature, but in that very nature which He took from Mary,—God in human nature; for as the Divine nature can neither suffer, nor obey, nor merit, it was only in human nature, in the flesh, become really His nature, that God could perform the work of Redemption, that He could satisfy for sin, and merit for us the grace of pardon and satisfaction. Mary is thus

called, and rightly called, "the Mother of Grace," for she is that, inasmuch as she is the Mother of the Sacred Flesh through which grace has been purchased and is communicated to us.

Again: Let your readers turn to St. Luke, i. 26-38. They will find that the Incarnation did not take place without Mary's free and voluntary consent. It was asked and given, though not given till an explanation had been demanded from God's messenger to Mary and received. Not until she is assured by Gabriel that 'no word is impossible with God' does she give her consent: "*Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it done to me according to thy Word.*" There was then a moment when the salvation of the world depended on the consent of Mary. Man could not be redeemed, satisfaction could not be made for sin, and grace obtained, without the Incarnation, and the Incarnation could not take place without the free, voluntary consent of this humble Jewish maiden. While, then, we are lost in admiration of the infinite condescension of God, that would do such honor to human nature, as in some sort to place Himself in dependence on the will of one of our race, to carry into effect His own purpose of infinite love and mercy, we cannot help feeling deep gratitude to Mary for the consent she gave. We call her blessed for the great things He that is mighty has done to her, and we bless her also for her own consent to the work of redemption. She gave to that work all she had; she gave her will; she gave her flesh; she gave her own and only Son to one long passion of thirty-three years, to the agony in the garden, and to the death on the Cross. It is true, God had selected her from all eternity to be His Mother, and had filled her with grace; but neither the election nor the grace took away her free will, or diminished the merit of her voluntary consent. She could have refused; and deserves she no love and gratitude from us, who have hope only through her flesh assumed by the Son of God, that she did not refuse? Can we say, in view of this fact, that she has no peculiar relation to our Redemption, no share in the work of our Salvation? To say so would be simply to deny that we are redeemed and saved by God in the flesh, that the human nature of our Lord performs any office in the work of redemp-

tion and salvation. Therefore to refuse to honor Mary as connected with and sharing in that work is to deny that it is in His human nature that God redeems and saves us, which is either to deny redemption and salvation altogether, or to contend that God redeems and saves us in His Divinity, that is, to contend that the Divine nature suffered and died, which is absurd.

“If we have faith,” says Cardinal Newman, “to admit the Incarnation itself, we must admit it in its fullness; why then should we start at the gracious appointments which arise out of it, are necessary to it, or are included in it?” It established between Mary and Jesus the real relation of mother and son. This relation is a subsisting relation, and subsists as really in Heaven as it did when both were on earth; and therefore Mary still preserves all her maternal rights in regard to her Son, and He still owes her all filial love, reverence, and obedience. For if He is God, He is also man, and in His humanity has all that pertains to pure and sinless humanity. The Son of God in His humanity, not of course in His Divine nature, nor in any matter which is proper to Him, only in that nature, was subject to Mary here, and obeyed her—St. Luke ii. 51; and as the two natures remain in Him forever distinct, two natures in one person, I know no reason for supposing that the relation, and what pertains essentially to it, between the mother and the son in His human nature, are not precisely, save that both are now in a glorified state, what they were when on the earth. We are not to suppose the soul loses in the future life the habits of this—(see Joseph Cook’s “Final Permanence of Moral Character”)—and therefore we must suppose that the habit of obedience, love, and reverence of our Divine Lord to His holy mother here, are still retained. Therefore, we conclude surely that her will, always one with God’s will, because moved by the Divine charity, is still regarded by Him as the will of His mother, and has that weight with Him that the right will of a mother must always have with a good, loving son.

Once more. Mary is also *our* mother, the mother of all true Christians. They who never reflect on the Mystery of the

Incarnation, and who have no faith in redemption through the Cross, laugh at us when we call Mary our mother. Yet she is our mother, and, to say the least, as truly our mother as was Eve herself. Eutychianism is a heresy. The human nature hypostatistically united to the Divine, remains forever distinct from the Divine nature, and, therefore, our Lord remains forever God and man in one Divine person. By assuming our nature the Son of God has made Himself our *Brother*. We become, through the nature so assumed, of the same nature with God. Hence, He is not ashamed to call us *brethren*. Now of this human nature in Christ, by which we become united to God by nature, *Mary is the mother*, and as there is but one human nature as well as but one Divine nature, she is truly *our* mother, in so far as we through that human nature become united to Him. She is not our natural mother in the sense of mother of our personality, but of our nature in God, and in so far as we were raised to *brotherhood with Christ her Son*, and are made through Him one with God.

She is our *spiritual* mother, for it is only through her flesh, assumed by the Son of God, that we were redeemed and begotten to the new spiritual life. I cannot too often repeat, that it is the Word made flesh, or God in the flesh, that redeems and saves or beatifies us. It is always through the Incarnate Son that we have access to the Father, or that even the saints in heaven become one with God, and behold Him in the Beatific Vision as He is. The life we, as Christians, live here is the life that proceeds from God *in His Humanity*, and the life we hope to live hereafter proceeds from Him in the same sense. To suppose the saint here or hereafter separated from the flesh, which God assumed from Mary, would be to suppose his annihilation as a saint, as much as to suppose our separation from God as Creator would be to suppose the annihilation of our natural existence. Here is the mystery of godliness which was manifest in the flesh. Then, unless we can make it true that Mary is not the Mother of our Lord in His human nature, we cannot make it untrue that she is our spiritual mother. So long as spiritual life is dependent on God in His human nature, so long is Mary truly the mother of spiritual life,

and so long as she is the mother of that life, so long is she our spiritual mother, and to be honored as such, and honored even more than our natural mother, for the spiritual life is infinitely more than the natural life.

Lastly. We call Mary the Queen of Heaven—of heaven and earth—Universal Queen. This is our explanation: Our Divine Lord is King, for to Him has all dominion been given. He is King, not merely as Son of God, in His Divine nature, but He is King in His human nature, as Son of Mary. Her Son is King; then, as mother of the King, we love to call her Queen, the Queen His mother. As He loves and honors His mother, and must as a good son wish all creatures also to love and honor her, He must have crowned her Queen, and given her a formal title to the love, honor, and obedience due to a Queen. How suggestive of thought in this connection is that beautiful picture of King Solomon and his mother: "Then Bethsabee came to King Solomon, to speak to him for Adonias: and the King arose to meet her, and bowed to her, and sat down upon his throne: and a throne was set for the king's mother, and she sat on his right hand" (3 Kings ii. 19).

LETTER XVII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—In my letter of Tuesday I submitted considerations which will fully justify our warm devotion to Mary, and the strongest expressions which the fervor of Catholic piety can use. They explain, too, why Mary holds so distinguished a place in Christian worship, and performs so important a mission in furtherance of the mediatorial work of Her Divine Son. Her love is greater, for she is "full of grace," as the Archangel declared, greater than that of any other creature. She is more intimately connected with the Holy Trinity, and holds a relation to God which is held and can be held by no

other creature. In some sense, as the Mother of the Incarnate Word, she is the medium through which is effected the deification of man,—the end of the supernatural order. She cannot be separated from that end. We can easily understand, then, why God should assign her a part assigned to no other creature. Her love is only less than His, and her heart is always in perfect unison with the Sacred Heart of her Son, and mother and son are strictly united and inseparable. Equally easy is it now to understand why the Christian heart overflows with love and gratitude to Mary; why Christians recur to her with so much confidence in the efficacy of her prayers, the success of her intercession; and why Catholics offer her the highest honor below the supreme worship offered in the Holy Sacrifice, but never offered except to God alone.

Protestants call the veneration we pay to Our Lady, in which “it is their sad and sorrowful lot” to have no share, Mariolatry, and in order to justify their alienation from the family of Christ, seek, under pretext of zeal for the honor of God, to brand it as “idolatrous.” I am not at all surprised by this. They have lost the deep sense of the Christian religion, and really retain no worship to God superior to that which we pay to Him in His saints. In regard to external worship, it is not we who worship Mary as God, but they who do not worship God Himself as God. The peculiar distinctive external worship of God is the offering of sacrifice; but Protestants have no sacrifice, as they have no priesthood, and no altar—even their churches are only meeting houses, or places of assembling together. In rejecting the holy sacrifice of the Mass, they have retained nothing more than we offer to Mary and the saints. Consequently they are unable to perceive any distinction between what they regard as the external worship of God, and that which we render to Him in His saints—that is, a worship of prayer and praise. But we have a sacrifice, and are therefore able to distinguish between the highest honor we render to His saints, and the supreme worship we render to Him. Supreme religious worship is sacrifice, and sacrifice we offer to God only, never to any creature.

The Protestant may speak of internal sacrifices, those of a

broken heart, and of inward justice, but these are only sacrifices by way of analogy, and what should always accompany the sacrifice proper. If the Protestant tells me he has in the interior homage of contrition and real submission of himself a distinct and peculiar worship of God, I must tell him in return that then he must not call the veneration we render to Mary Mariolatry, because this homage and submission in the sense he means, we never offer to her. If he has something in this interior homage that pertains to supreme worship, the worship of *Latria*, he must bear in mind that we do not offer it to the saints, and therefore our veneration of them is not "idolatry"; if he has not something of this sort, then he does not himself offer any worship proper to God, external or internal, and therefore has in no sense any worship to offer to God of a higher order than that which we offer to Mary and the Saints. Hence Catholics are not surprised when Protestants accuse them of Mariolatry. *Not one out of five thousand knows what he is talking about.*

The simple truth is, that the Protestant, including the "true Catholic" Ritualist, rejects the veneration of Mary, because he does not believe in the Incarnation, and his calling it Mariolatry is only a proof that he "dissolves Jesus," and does not believe that salvation comes from God in the flesh, from God whose nature is human nature as well as divine nature. The honor we render to Mary is in the last analysis the honor we pay to the sacred mystery of the Incarnation, and either it is idolatry to worship the human nature of Christ, that is, God in His human nature, or our devotion to Mary is not idolatry. The first, none but a Unitarian dare assert, and therefore none other dare deny the last.

Scientific Theology has its technical terms, as philosophic and physical science have theirs. Hence the words—*Latria*, *Dulia*, and *Hyperdulia*—used in dogmatic treatises on the subject. Our whole doctrine and practice, then, in this particular, as fully understood by every Catholic child, is expressed in the three following propositions:

1st. We give to God alone, on account of His infinite perfections, the supreme homage of adoration, which is due

to Him alone, and which is called by Catholic Theologians — *Latria*. Protestants, including *small* Ritualists, repeat in the Nineteenth century the slander of Faustus, the old Manichean heretic. I commend to both St. Augustine's answer to Faustus, as true now as when that old "Romanist" gave it: "With that worship which in Greek is called *latreia* (in Latin it cannot be expressed by one word), as it is a kind of service properly due to the Divinity, we neither worship, nor teach to worship, other than the one God." *Contra Faustum*, L. 20, C. 21.

2d. We honor angels and saints as God's servants and friends, with an homage which they deserve as such, and which is altogether different from that which we pay to God; and this veneration of the saints goes by the theological name of *Dulia*.

3d. We honor in a special manner *among the Saints* the Virgin Mother, Queen of all angels and saints, on account of her eminent sanctity and her sublime and most intimate relationship with the adorable Trinity; since the Word of God, who is from all eternity begotten of the Father, and consubstantial with Him, was in the fullness of time begotten of her, taking to Himself from her immaculate body our human nature. This special honor which we pay to the Virgin Mother of God is called—*Hyperdulia*, the homage paid to the most highly privileged creature, but *as* to a *creature*, and therefore never to be compared with the worship which we give to God.

Is there any "idolatry," "apostasy," "infidelity," or "impiety" in this? I am defending the creed of my heart and of my mind, the creed of the Catholic Church, against the wanton insults and vindictive slanders of the Vicar, and I appeal to even the smouldering spark of that tenderness implanted by God in every man's breast and still more in every woman's. If the Incarnation is the sole fountain of life, grace, and benediction to all God's intelligent creatures, and some receive more and some less from that Divine Treasury,—is it "idolatry" to hold that she in whom the stupendous mystery was actually accomplished, with her own consent, received a fuller measure

than others, whose consent was never asked, who approach it from afar, and only accept it by faith? If to touch even the "garment" of her Creator and Son was to feel the might of His Divinity, so that "virtue went out of Him," and the weak became strong,—is it "idolatry" to say that she, who bore Him in her womb, who nourished Him at her breasts, who enfolded Him in her arms, and who caressed Him with her lips, was transfigured by a union with the Living God which "The Seven Spirits before the Throne" would not have been able to endure, and received from the Almighty the filial embraces which the Seraphim would not have dared to accept? If at the sound of His voice the dead stood up, the winds were hushed, and the demons fled away,—is it "idolatry" to believe that she, who listened to that voice for thirty years, speaking as it never spoke to man or angel, and revealing unimaginable abysses of light which no other creature could have seen and lived, that she derived some special benefit from what she saw and heard, and that her wisdom transcended all that human thoughts can conceive, because she alone had for her teacher the Uncreated Wisdom of God? If to look, for one brief moment, on His adorable Face, which is the Light of Heaven, would seem to us the most transporting joy which a creature could ask or obtain; what is it to have watched that Face with worshipful love day after day and year after year—to have dwelt for weeks and months together in the same house, and sat at the same table—to have touched at one time His omnipotent Hand, at another His sacred Head—to have looked into the eyes of the God-Man and seen the movement of His divine lips—and to have done all this with an unceasing adoration, by day and by night, more perfect than ever was offered to their Almighty King by the greatest princes of the heavenly court? Is it, too, "idolatry" to claim that these soul-dazzling thoughts suggest motives for devotion to Mary, much more the conviction that she is the Queen of angels and men, as well as the Mother of God?

Again: If the share which He assigned to this Incomparable Creature in the work of our salvation was present to His thoughts even in the supreme hour of His agony,

so that His last words from the Cross to each of His elect was this: "Behold thy Mother!"—is it "idolatry" to recognize an office so set forth, to call her our Mother because she was His, and to tremble lest we forfeit the protection which He wills her to extend to all His children and hers? If she was the Mother of the *Natural* Body of Christ, which derived from her its life, and the supply of all its needs,—is it "idolatry" to believe that He made her the Mother of His *Mystical* Body also, that the lower was included in the higher, or that He willed her to do for His Church what He made her worthy to do for Himself? If the Divine Word, by whom all things were made, "*was subject to*" His own creature, as a child is subject to his mother, and Mary ruled Him who rules the universe,—is it "idolatry" to suppose that she has any influence over Him now, that He continues to treat her as a Mother, or that He grants requests which she presents to Him in heaven, because He obeyed so promptly those which she addressed to Him on earth? If He wrought His first miracle to give pleasure to her, and to relieve a transient pang which had moved her gentle pity, and if He did this, as she evidently knew He would, though "the hour was not yet come,"—is it "idolatry" to suppose that she still continues to call His attention to the wants of her clients, or that He continues to supply them at her word? If His sacred Passion was the expiation of our guilt, who were not consulted about it, and neither approved nor dissuaded it, but are constantly renewing it by our sins,—is it "idolatry" to praise and exalt her who generously acquiesced, for the love of us, in the death of that dear Son to whom she had given birth? If the Precious Blood which was shed on the Cross cancelled death, and satisfied the justice of God,—is it "idolatry" to assert, as one of her titles to our reverence, that this life-giving Blood, by which we are saved, first flowed in Mary's veins?

Once more: If to have been only a *servant* of God shall win, in spite of defects and shortcomings, such a recompense as "it hath not entered the heart of man to conceive,"—is it "idolatry" to imagine that anything higher was reserved for her whom He chose to be His *mother*, and whom He had

already made so great by the majesty of His gifts, that nothing could make her greater but the glory of her maternity? If Catholics have never ceased to adore the Divinity of her Son, and to worship the sacred mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation; and if heretics, after professing to refuse devotion to her only out of reverence for God, have come in every land, to doubt or deny the highest truths of Revelation,—is it “idolatry” to hold that the former proves devotion to her *to be the safeguard of faith*, and to see, in the latter, evidence that men who begin by declining to honor the mother are sure to end by blaspheming the Son? The Anglo-ritualist *Union Review*, quoted in the second letter of this *Rejoinder*, proves this. It says: “*Nestorianism*,” that is a denial of Christ’s humanity, “*prevails to a very great extent among English Churchmen, and its withering effects are very difficult to shake off even by those who have long become orthodox in their theoretical creed.*” Terrible and affrighting confession! “*It is also true,*” the *Review* adds, “*and deserves consideration, that there has been hitherto no marked tendency to heresy on the subject of the Incarnation among Roman Catholics, while where the dignity of the Blessed Virgin has been underrated, heresies have speedily crept in.*” I refer your readers to the full quotation.

Lastly: If Anglicans and Ritualists are distinguished, first, by indifference, and then by dislike, to the blessed Mary until “they can no longer hear her named without feeling tormented as were the demoniacs by the presence of our Lord, and their hatred finds too often vent in blasphemies which belong not to man, but to those evil spirits which then possess them,”—is it “idolatry” to find in this a verification of the words which were spoken from the beginning: “I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed,” and to remind the Vicar of the lessons for him in the peaceful stability of Catholics who honor Mary, compared with the dismal apostasy of the theological “bone of his bone,” who condemn her, notwithstanding the famous “sermon” forced from him by his necessities in this discussion?¹

¹ See Marshall’s *My Clerical Friends*.

LETTER XVIII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—In my last two letters I was occupied in stating the true doctrine of the Incarnation, and in drawing from it some idea of Mary's greatness. I have made it clear that in the hierarchy of creatures the highest place must needs belong to her through whom the Creator received a created nature. In the Incarnation the spheres of the Infinite and the Finite touched at a point. In the finite sphere that point was Mary. In this truth Protestants *ought* to discover that there is a significance. What was her greatness? Was it that she was the mother of a great Prophet? No! To be the mother of the greatest child of earth that the Jew of old, or the later Nestorian, could conceive—this was *not* Mary's greatness. She was not the mother of the highest mere creature; she was herself the highest in the scale of mere creatures, because the Creator was, in His humanity, her Son. That which we know of God's servants is *their work*. The work allotted to Mary was the Divine Maternity. Those who admit that this immeasurable gift was hers, yet see nothing in it, who speak as if it was hers by accident, and might have equally been another's—whereas it was hers by an original predestination, with her solemn consent, and in concurrence with the plenary grace which prepared her for it,—those who believe that not a sparrow falls to the ground without God's will, yet who find nothing noteworthy in the highest elevation to which God has ever advanced the creature formed in His own image—such persons “have eyes and see not.” It is not from any real force in the objections urged by Protestants that their blindness in this matter arises. It comes from the superficiality of the unspiritual intelligence, hardness of heart, and consequent lack of spiritual insight. To believe vitally in matters of religion, one must love: “*With the heart man believeth unto salvation.*” As Christianity built upon the heart originally, so it must vanish out of the world—and the

process may be so gradual as to be imperceptible—in proportion as a decay of charity makes the heart superficial by making it hard. The Pagan nature was hard, harder even in the polished Greek than in the rough Roman, and for this reason it was superficial and vain. Greek art loved the beautiful, and could, on occasion, show forth the terrible; but the pathos that everywhere underlies human life it could not feel, or chose to ignore. Pagan philosophy was like Pagan art. It was superficial and hard, and for that reason it was vain. It was proud of the body and proud of the mind; and in a balanced condition of both, it placed its ideal of perfection. But Christianity exalted the soul, in which alone is to be found the characteristic excellence of humanity. The *intellect* is a feverish activity within a narrow sphere; the human *soul* has a passive power in the depth of which lies the boundless receptivity of Faith. In what Paganism would have despised as the soft, the feeble, the *womanly* in human nature, lay that which united with weakness the strength conceded to weakness, and the gift of spiritual fruitfulness. This is why the Protestant intelligence so often fails to see the greatness of Mary. It fancies itself shocked when she is called the “highest of creatures”; yet if some German dreamer or mystic undertook to prove that St. Michael or St. Gabriel were the highest of creatures, it would find nothing alarming in such elevation. Nay, if it chanced to light on a text or two, which, in its estimation, assigned that rank to the Blessed Virgin, with a better theology, a whole world of false philosophy might, perhaps, melt like mist; and those who have persuaded themselves that the veneration of the highest creature puts her in the place of God might discover—what a true Theism teaches the child and the unlearned believer—that between the Infinite and the Finite, whether in the highest or the lowest example of the latter, the distance must ever remain infinite.

Again: In this attitude of the Protestant mind towards Mary, ever blessed, I find a parallel to its treatment of our dear Lord Himself. Not only those who walked with Him in the days of His humiliation did not know Him, but even now, after His kingdom has been established for nearly nineteen centuries

upon earth, multitudes deny His Divinity, and vindicate that denial out of the Gospel; while other multitudes who think that they believe it, disbelieve it, unconsciously (I hope) assigning to Him a double Personality as well as two Natures, and denying, consequently, that His mother is the "Mother of God." Holy Scripture is confessedly appealed to both by those who assail and those who confess the Divinity of Christ. It is appealed to no less by those who assail and those who confess the greatness of Mary. As to the place assigned to others in the Scriptures—to Moses, to David, to St. Paul, or St. John—there is no doubt. The Bible is only challenged on both sides in the case of those *two* whose position, *though infinitely unequal*, was alike exceptional—the Creator Incarnate and the creature who was made the instrument of the Incarnation. Dr. Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, was a prelate of that defunct Irish Establishment so long an incubus and a *blotch* upon Catholic Ireland. He, who with Alexander Knox, in some sort anticipated the High Church movement in England, (see *Contemporary Review*, August, 1887,) makes a striking statement in one of his works. The Roman Catholic Church, he says, has been preserved by a special Providence, because it alone was found to be the inexpugnable citadel of the doctrine of the Trinity—the various Protestant bodies having always betrayed a tendency to Arianism or Unitarianism. No wonder that it should be thus with them. Arguments strictly analogous to those urged against the greatness of Mary are used against the Divinity of her Son; and the same general objection is made, viz.: That so great a mystery, if revealed at all, must needs have been revealed plainly. We meet, too, identically the same misconceptions. "What you give to Mary," urges one objector, "you take from Christ." "What you give to Christ," the Unitarian adds, "you take from God." One would imagine the Vicar sided with the Unitarian from the *exulting magnanimity* with which he surrenders to him the testimony of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses" (1 John v. 7, 8), omitted in the Revised Version. I had rather say that the world could better spare a whole bench of Anglican Bishops—the whole Lambeth Conference—than

one single verse of Holy Writ which bears witness to Christ's Divinity and the mystery of the Blessed Trinity.

Mary's maternity, which was the crown of creation, and the way by which its Creator became its Redeemer, conferred upon her a greatness which cannot be augmented. Even the WORLD goes on repeating that it was this idea that elevated womanhood, and led the way to a spiritual civilization; yet what that idea is, it can hardly answer in detail. The thought of her trembles on the surface of its troubled intelligence like the dawn upon a lake. In its knowledge, and even in its ignorance, it is reverential. It reverences in her the image of her Son. It recognizes also her own image in the Saints, and in those most like the Saints upon earth. I could fill a column with tributes from Byron, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Holmes, Longfellow, Willis, and Poe. The Ritualist controversialist of the Littledale stripe alone is bitter when he treats of her. The world, so far as it does not absolutely disown its Divine Lord, pays a homage it scarcely intends to pay to the great maternal sanctity. This is not wonderful. The world is protected even by indifferentism itself from some aberrations—from that distorted vision, for instance, which is produced by such polemical fanaticism as I am now considering; and the common sense on which it prides itself teaches it that the Religion of the Incarnation must ever be, what it has ever been, the cause of "*Jesus and Mary*." The Catholic Church is *the* church of the Incarnation, and therefore only in her are "*Jesus and Mary*" to be found ever and inseparably united—only there are they truly at home. Let me prove all this out of the mouths of Anglican witnesses.

"The pious and affectionate Bishop Hall," as Pusey calls him, writes:

"But how gladly do we second the Angel in the praise of her, which was more ours than His! How justly do we bless her, whom the Angel pronounces blessed! How worthily is she honored of men, whom the Angel proclaims blessed of God! *O blessed Mary, he cannot bless thee, he cannot honor thee too much, that deifies thee not!* That which the angel said of thee, thou hast prophesied of thyself; we believe the Angel,

and thee : 'All generations shall call thee blessed,' by the Fruit of whose womb all generations are blessed."

Bishop Pearson, styled by Pusey "exact and theological," writes :

"The necessity of believing our Saviour thus to be 'born of the Virgin Mary,' will appear both in respect of her who was the mother, and of Him Who was the Son.

"In respect of her it was therefore necessary that we might perpetually preserve an esteem of her person, proportionable to so high a dignity. It was her own prediction, 'From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed'; but the obligation is ours to call her, to esteem her so. If Elizabeth cried out with so loud a voice, 'Blessed art thou amongst women,' when Christ was but newly conceived in her womb, *what expressions of honor and admiration can we think sufficient*, now that Christ is in heaven, and that mother with Him? Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted her, which is incommunicable to any other. We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the 'Mother of our Lord,' so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord Himself. Let us keep the language of the primitive church: 'Let her be honored and esteemed; let Him be worshipped and adored.'"

The learned but controversial Bishop Hicckes writes :

"God the Father, who was to prepare a body for His Eternal Son, as it is written, 'a Body hast Thou prepared Me,' would not form it of the substance of a sinful woman; but His own essential holiness, as well as the mysterious decency of the dispensation, would prompt Him to form it of the substance of one, that like the king's daughter in the psalm, was 'all-glorious within,' and a pure and spotless Virgin, both in body and mind. The fullness of the Godhead would not dwell bodily in a wicked woman, nor would *she* be deceived and led away by the serpent, whose heel was to bruise the serpent's head. (*Here is IPSA from one of the Vicar's own Bishops!*) To be chosen for the Mother of God was the greatest honor and favor that ever God conferred upon any human creature. None of the special honors and favors that He did to any of

the saints before or since are equivalent to the honor of being the Mother of God, and, therefore, we may be sure that God who said, 'Them that honor Me, I will honor,' would not have done so great an honor to any daughter of Abraham, but to one who best deserved it, who had no superior for holiness upon earth. If we had no particular account of her graces, we might naturally conclude all this from the history of our Lord's Incarnation; for nothing less than a superlative holiness could receive such a testimony of Divine honor from the Holy Trinity. She was, as it were, the spouse of God, Co-parent with Him of the wonderful Immanuel, who was God and man, 'God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man of the substance of His Holy Mother, born in the world,' 'Perfect God and perfect Man,' 'yet not two but one Christ.' . . . And therefore it is our duty, who have the benefit of her example, to honor and celebrate her name and commemorate her virtues, and set forth her praises, in whom there was a concurrence of so many Divine accomplishments, etc. If the names of other saints are distinguished with miniature, hers ought to shine with gold, especially, if we consider that she, of all the virgin daughters of Israel, had the honor to be chosen by the Holy Trinity for the mother of our Lord. 'What shall be done to the woman whom the King of Kings delighted to honor?' Certainly if we should hold our peace and refuse to praise her among women, the stones of the church would cry out, 'the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam of the timber shall answer it.' Wheresoever the Gospel is preached, that which she hath done and suffered for our Lord ought to be spoken of for a memorial of her, from whom He took that very Body which was crucified, and that precious Blood which was shed for the remission of our sin."

Again, the Rev. Dr. Frank writes:

"I shall not need to tell you who this 'she' or who this 'Him.' The day rises with it on its wings. The day wrote it with the first ray of the morning sun upon the posts of the world. The angels sang it in their choirs, the morning stars together in their course. The Virgin Mother, the Eternal Son! The most blessed among women, the fairest of the sons

of men. *The woman clothed with the sun, the sun compassed with the woman*; she the gate of heaven; He the King of Glory, that came forth. She the mother of the Everlasting God: He God without a mother; God blessed for evermore. Great persons as ever met upon a day."

For uttering thoughts not more beautiful than these, St. John of Damascus, in the "Mission Chapel," so called, was characterized as a "blind guide leading the blind multitude!"

Again, George Herbert writes:

I would address
My vows to thee most gladly, blessed Maid,
And mother of my God, in my distress.

Thou art the holy mine, whence came the gold,
The great restoration for all decay

In young and old.

Thou art the cabinet where the jewel lay—
Chiefly to thee would I my soul unfold.

.

I can fitly close these quotations with Keble's beautiful little poem on "The Annunciation," from "The Christian Year." Your readers will remember that Keble, with Pusey and Cardinal Newman, started, in 1833, the "Tractarian Movement," from which Ritualism "cropped up" a few years ago. Froude says that Keble and Pusey were the ciphers—Newman the indicating number. Keble lived and died a quiet country parson of the English religion; Pusey, years before his death, practically quitted it without formally joining the Catholic Church, although he preached and practiced *nearly all* her doctrines, while Newman, drawing the logical conclusions from their common premises, *reverted* to the old religion, became a "benighted Romanist," and preserved, at least, his intellectual self-respect.

I ask your readers' attention to the last stanza of the poem. The Vicar has given us nothing more "extravagant" from "Liguori and the Raccolta" than the utterances of Keble and Bishop Hall, to say nothing of Hickes and Frank:

Ave Maria ! Blessed Maid !
 Lily of Eden's fragrant shade,
 Who can express the love,
 That nurtured thee, so pure and sweet,
 Making thy heart a shelter meet
 For Jesus' Holy Dove ?

Ave Maria ! Mother blest,
 To whom, caressing and caress'd,
 Clings the Eternal Child :
 Favour'd beyond archangels' dream,
 When first on thee with tenderest gleam
 Thy new-born Saviour smiled.

Ave Maria ! Thou whose name
All but adoring love may claim,
 Yet may we reach thy shrine ;
 For He, thy Son and Saviour, vows
 To crown all lowly lofty brows
 With love and joy like thine.

These quotations well express the thoughts of a few choice minds in Anglicanism, but alas ! they are not Anglican thoughts. The Vicar has long since confessed that "it is the hard and sorrowful lot of the English Church" to be among those who dishonor the mother of God. Well he knows that no sectaries have surpassed, few have equalled Anglicans, in ingratitude and irreverence towards her in whom the Most High became Incarnate. These thoughts came to Anglican hearts from a higher spiritual zone than that which can only believe in a motherless Saviour, as it believes only in a divided church—they came from the Church of the Incarnation, the home of "Jesus and Mary."

LETTER XIX.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—As an introduction to my examination of the quotations from "Liguori and the Raccolta," I devote this letter

to Dr. Pusey, whom, by the Vicar's blundering perverseness, your readers have doubtless set down as a witness most hostile to us. Indeed I propose nothing less than to vindicate his memory against the dishonor the Vicar seeks to put upon it. He invokes the authority of Pusey's name to cloak his own malice and ignorance, and uses it as a theological scarecrow to divert the attention of logical and honest Protestants from his own humiliating position. He makes him sponsor for charges against the Catholic Church at which Pusey would stand aghast. This is an injustice to Pusey which I cannot permit. After Newman had become in England the "Achilles of the City of God," Pusey, now the "Hector of a doomed Troy," labored with unbounded zeal and ability for fifty years to propagate some of the most fundamental Catholic dogmas. His essay on Baptismal Regeneration, scouted by his own church in the Privy Council judgment in the Gorham case, is the most thorough and exhaustive one in English. It has had an incalculable influence over the theological mind of the Episcopal Church in England and America in laying the foundation of a right belief in sacramental grace, and thus preparing the way for the reception of the entire Catholic system. The same may be said, in part, respecting the doctrine of the Real Presence, the authority of Tradition, and other points. By dint of study, meditation, and prayer he worked his way with difficulty through thickets and morasses back to the very threshold of the Catholic Church. Why should I stand by and hear his name dishonored by one who to-day ungratefully enjoys the fruits of Pusey's toil amid the wreckage of Christianity in the Anglican Establishment? Why should I offer a stinted homage to his devout and deeply religious spirit, the purity and goodness of his life, and the profound learning, in certain departments, which he brought to the service of the Catholic cause? It is a great gain that thousands to-day in the Anglican Church confess truths revealed by God which they once blasphemed or ridiculed. And, more than this, it is a gain still greater that by degrees the prejudices which have so long veiled the minds of Anglicans of all classes in Egyptian darkness, and made it morally

impossible for them to see the brightness and glory of the Catholic Church, have already been removed from the hearts of thousands. An ordinary Anglican, fifty years ago, really and truly believed all the monstrous, almost unimaginable horrors which have been handed down by a Protestant tradition to the dishonor of the church. Such a man was, humanly speaking, as little likely ever even to think of becoming a Catholic as to think of becoming a Mahometan or a Hindoo. He never thought of looking into a Catholic church, or of opening a Catholic book. How utterly he was in darkness as to what it all meant we may imagine, when such a man as Cardinal Newman records that as late as 1833, when he had been for some years "in orders," and had already written his learned work on the Arians, he "knew nothing of the presence of the Blessed Sacrament" in the Catholic churches into which he accidentally strayed while waiting at Palermo for a passage to England. Instead of this totally ignorant generation sincerely believing that all the points in which the "Roman Church" differed from their own were "pagan superstitions" and "abominations," the Ritualists are giving us a generation thousands of which will have been trained from their childhood to believe that all the distinctive doctrines of the Catholic Church against which Protestants have for centuries been blaspheming, are living and life-giving truths—the Real Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Confession and Absolution, the Religious Life and Vows and the Invocation of the Saints. All these things, which the last generation believed to be worse than Paganism, they know to be truth and life. After Newman's reversion Pusey continued the Tractarian Movement in the Church of England with increased vigor, and he devoted to it every power and faculty he possessed—position, wealth, learning, and intellect. The result was that multitudes of souls have been brought by him from far-distant wanderings in regions of darkness and cold, to a position, as yet, indeed, outside the church, but yet sufficiently near to her to ensure their feeling her attraction. Besides, how many of his disciples have now the happiness to be Catholics? Outstripping their master, seeking a clearer atmosphere than that in which he was con-

tent to dwell, a broader and firmer grasp of divine verities than that which he possessed, they have found, one after another, their way to the region of light, the fullness of truth. Pius IX. used to liken him to a church bell, summoning others to the household of faith, but remaining himself without. The submission of so many of his valued and trusted associates to the Catholic Church was a great sorrow to Pusey. Why did he not follow them? It might almost seem, to human eyes, as if his excellences and virtues merited the grace which was given to many others who, as far as human judgment can deem, showed far less disposition to faith. A mighty question, indeed, and one upon which all speculation must be more or less unsatisfactory. For myself, I do not hesitate to express my *belief* that he *died* in the bosom of the Catholic Church, and that he met his Maker with the eternal sunshine of the full-orbed glory of Catholic truth beaming in his face.

How was Pusey treated by the Anglican Establishment which he labored so long and so faithfully to Catholicize and vivify? Let the London *Times* answer: "By the concurrence of an infinite number of witnesses Dr. Pusey is the nominal founder of the existing phase of the Church of England. . . . He has seen an incessant warfare of controversy, litigation, and rival demonstrations. He has heard of more hostile charges than man could remember or read. But he has seen all sides agree in acknowledging Dr. Pusey to be the author of this *restoration* or of this *corruption*. It is he that has scattered *blessings* over the land or *curses*. Half the English theological world has revered him as a saint, . . . half have found no charge or insinuation too bad for him. It is Dr. Pusey who has been the Reformer or the Heresiarch of the Century." I beg to give your readers a sample of the "curses" attributed to Pusey as reckoned by his Low Church brethren. Two months before Pusey's death the Rev. Mr. Smelt, speaking before a Bible society, concluded his speech with this peroration: "If we 'take stock' of the result of two generations of Ritualistic teaching, we find that (a) our schools are schools of free-thought; (b) our churches are Mass-houses; (c) our litera-

ture is steeped in skepticism even when it shrinks from an open rejection of revelation ; (*d*) license revels in our institutions ; (*e*) vice riots in our streets ; (*f*) an ever increasing laxity of morals pervades all grades of society ; (*g*) venality, which does but correspond to the absence of principle among public men, is rampant throughout the constituencies ; (*h*) while anarchy, threatening to turn to rebellion, meets us on all sides and in every form ! Such, when we sum them up, are the fruits—call them rather the *first-fruits*, for there are worse to come, of the much-vaunted Catholic movement, which its abettors declared, and its dupes believed, was destined to purify the Church and revivify the State. Such is the price we have to pay for converting the *Protestant Minister into the Massing Priest* ! May God in His mercy forgive us and send us help from His holy place !” This I take from that *amiable* Low Church organ, the *Rock*. Oxford University, which Canon Liddon says may “in a few years at most” cease to be a Christian university, suspended Pusey from its pulpit for two years because of a sermon delivered there on the Real Presence. He declared to his bishop, Wilberforce, his belief in Purgatory and the Invocation of Saints, and the bishop scolded and tried to “bully” him. The preface to his sermon on “The Entire Absolution of the Penitent” is one long and fervid recommendation of the practice of Confession, and he impresses upon men that Confession is the only satisfactory way to ensure a quiet conscience and that therefore it is “generally necessary.” He acted as Confessor and Director to persons of all classes and of both sexes all over England, and published a long letter in defence of the principle that “the Church of England leaves her children free to whom to open their griefs.” Again Bishop Wilberforce, whose daughter and three of whose brothers became Catholics, “charged” against him. “The fact remains,” he says, “you seem to me to be habitually assuming the place and doing the work of a Roman Confessor, and not that of an English clergyman.” The Bishop then prohibited him from performing any ministerial act in his diocese. Pusey went right on adapting Catholic books of devotion for Anglican use. Again Wilberforce fulminated and addressed to Pusey these

words: "Events have deepened my conviction that the effect of your ministry has been in many cases to lead those who follow your guidance to become dissatisfied with the pure Scriptural teaching and services of our own church and to join the Roman schism." And again the Bishop tells him: "You nourish amongst those whom you guide religious principles and practices for which the Church of England affords no warrant, but which belong, and so ultimately surely lead, to the Church of Rome." Day after day the Bishop's prophecies were fulfilled as one after another in rapid succession Pusey's associates and adherents became Catholics. I cannot enlarge on this now. Dean Hook was a celebrated moderate High Churchman in these times. In a letter to *The Guardian* he calls Pusey and his friends "Romanizers," and sums up their work in these words: "I now find them calumniators of the Church of England, and vindicators of the Church of Rome; palliating the vices of the Romish system, and magnifying the deficiencies of the Church of England; sneering at everything Anglican, and admiring everything Romish; students of the Breviary and Missal, disciples of the schoolmen, converts to mediævalism, insinuating Romish sentiments, circulating and republishing Romish works; introducing Romish practices in their private, and infusing a Romish tone into their public devotions; introducing the Romish confessional, enjoining Romish penances, adopting Romish prostrations, recommending Romish litanies, muttering the Romish shibboleth, and rejoicing in the cant of Romish fanaticism, *assuming sometimes the garb of the Romish priesthood*, and venerating without imitating their celibacy, defending Romish miracles, and receiving as true the lying legends of Rome; almost adoring Romish saints, and complaining that we have had no saints in England since we purified our church; explaining away the idolatry, and pining for the Mariolatry of the Church of Rome; vituperating the English Reformation, and receiving for the truth the false doctrines of the Council of Trent, etc., etc. It is sometimes asked why we should be continually attacking the Church of Rome? When this question is put to us, I admire the subtlety, but not the candor of the querist. It is not against *Romanists*, but

against *Romanizers* that we write; against those who are doing the work of the Church of Rome while eating the bread of the Church of England." For all the facts given above I refer your readers to the "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," London, 1881; and the "Life of Dean Hook," London, 1878.

I now ask your readers' attention to some remarks on the *Eirenicon*, often referred to by the Vicar. Here, too, he has done injustice to Pusey. This work is in three volumes. The *first* is a letter to Keble, and the *second* and *third*, severally, letters to Father Newman occasioned by his reply to the *first*. For years before Pusey's death he worked earnestly to bring about a union between the Catholic and Anglican churches. He was dissatisfied with the individual secessions to Rome and desired to bring about a "corporate reunion," by which he and his party "through mutual explanations," might go over to Rome in a body—"without calling upon the Church of Rome to abandon anything to which she had pronounced to be '*de fide*'"—of faith. These are Pusey's very words (*Eirenicon*, vol. 2, p. 7). That is to say, he was ready to accept all the *dogmatic* teaching of the Catholic Church. "I have long been convinced," he writes, "that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were explained *authoritatively*—*i. e.*, by the Roman Church itself, not by individual theologians only." Pusey's Letter to the *London Weekly Register*, Nov. 22, 1865, written to thank the editor "with all my (his) heart for your (his) kind-hearted and appreciative review of my (his) *Eirenicon*." To promote the aspirations of this Unionist Movement headed by Pusey, an association was formed known as the "Order of Corporate Reunion." For the same purpose Pusey says he wrote the *Eirenicon*—a simple overture for peace, as the word implies. It was occasioned by a letter addressed to him by Dr. Manning, entitled: "The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England"—in which the Archbishop urged upon his old friend that all who believe in the supernatural order, in the revelation of Christianity, in the inspiration of Holy Scripture, in the divine certainty of dogmatic Tradition, in the divine obligation of holding no communion with heresy

and schism, are logically driven in upon the lines of the only stronghold which God has constituted as "the pillar and ground of the truth"—the Catholic Church. I have this letter now before me, and if your readers desire to get an idea of the cogency of the argument by which the appeal to Pusey was supported, let them read the article by Cardinal Manning in the current number of the *North American Review*, entitled: "*The Gladstone-Ingersoll Controversy: The Church a Witness to Herself.*"

One of the stumbling-blocks in the way of the reconciliation with Rome which Pusey sought, was the devotion of Catholics to the Mother of God. He poured into the first volume of the *Eirenicon* all his difficulties, prepossessions, and, to the Catholic mind, bewildering misconceptions and apparently perverse misunderstandings on the subject, but he said not a word about his own belief on the greatness of Mary. From this volume the Vicar has taken, almost *verbatim*, that "wider view of the Roman cultus of Mary" spread out in his last "Stricture," and without a single reference to the second volume in which Pusey explained, neutralized, and *practically retracted* the violent criticisms of his first volume—as I will show. For so heinous a crime against candor, honesty, and truth, and the memory of an honest-minded man, I know of no parallel in all the annals of misrepresentation. This is a grave misfortune for himself as well as a crying injustice to Pusey. And now to the proof.

Cardinal (then plain Father) Newman, in reply to the first volume, the original *Eirenicon*, addressed to Pusey his famous letter, than which there has never been written a more masterly and faultless specimen of Patristic and Scriptural exegesis. Other writers, indeed, had catalogued and exposed what the *Eirenicon* contained of misstatement, misquotation, unfair insinuation and conclusion. But the appearance of Dr. Newman on the scene was that "of the great Achilles moving to the war." The gleam of well-worn armor flashes on the eye, and the attention of both armies is riveted on him as he lifts his spear. He cannot mutter his favorite motto:

And well shall they perceive that, till this hour,
I paused from war (Iliad, B. xviii., L. 125);

for it is but lately that he struck down and kicked off the field the swaggering bully Kingsley, hardly worthy of his steel. It is different now. He will begin in true Homeric fashion with a complimentary harangue to the champion on the other side; but then will come the time for blows—blows of terrible force, dealt out with that gentle affectionateness which ever characterized the friendship of these two great souls. Dr. Newman begins by a generous tribute to Dr. Pusey himself, and to those whom he is supposed to influence. He allows him to have every right to mention the conditions on which he proposes to become a Catholic, as well as the right to state what it is that he objects to, as requiring explanation in the Catholic system. But then the tone changes and business begins. Dr. Newman tells his old friend in the plainest way that “there is much both in the matter and manner of his volume calculated to wound those who love him well, but truth more”; and he points out the glaring inconsistency of “professing to be composing an Irenicon while treating Catholics as foes”; and characterizes in his happy way, the proceeding of Pusey as “discharging an Olive branch as from a catapult.” “The hundred pages which you have devoted to the subject of the Blessed Virgin,” he tells him, “give a one-sided view of our teaching about her.” Few have characterized these pages in stronger terms than Dr. Newman. He asks Pusey: “What could an Exeter Hall orator, what could a Scotch commentator on the Apocalypse, do more for his own side of the controversy by the picture he drew of us?” Further on he pointedly reminds him that he *all the time knew better*. This brings me to the important point. After a proof from the Fathers as to the Catholic doctrine about the Blessed Virgin, he says to Pusey: “You know what the Fathers assert; but, if so, have you not, my dear friend, been unjust to yourself in your recent volume, and made far too much of the differences which exist between Anglicans and us on this particular point? It is the office of an Irenicon to smooth difficulties.

. . . . Had you happened in your volume to introduce your notice of our teaching about the Blessed Virgin, with a notice of the teaching of the Fathers concerning her, which you follow, ordinary men would have considered that there was not much to choose between you and us. Though you appealed ever so much, in your defence, to the authority of the 'Undivided Church,' they would have said that you, who had such high notions of the Blessed Mary, were one of the last men who had a right to accuse us of quasi-idolatry. When they found you with the Fathers calling her Mother of God, Second Eve, and Mother of all Living, the Mother of Life, the Morning Star, the Mystical New Heaven, the Sceptre of Orthodoxy, the All-undefiled Mother of Holiness, and the like, they would have deemed it a poor compensation for such language, that you protested against her being called a Co-Redemptress or a Priestess. And if they were violent Protestants, they would not have read you with the relish and gratitude with which, as it is, they have perhaps accepted your testimony against us. . . . They would have felt in this case that they had the same right to be shocked at you as you have to be shocked at us; and further, which is the point to which I am coming, they would have said, that, granting some of our modern writers go beyond the Fathers in this matter, still the line cannot be logically drawn between the teaching of the Fathers concerning the Blessed Virgin and our own. This view of the matter seems to me true and important; I do not think the line *can* be satisfactorily drawn." And again he urges on Pusey: "As you revere the Fathers, so you revere the Greek Church; and here again we have a witness on our behalf, *of which you must be aware as fully as we are*, and of which you really must intend to give us the benefit. In proportion as the Greek ritual is known to the religious public, that knowledge will take off the edge of the surprise of Anglicans at the sight of our devotions to our Lady. It must weigh with them, when they discover that we can enlist on our side in this controversy those 'Seventy Millions' of Orientals, who are separated from our communion. Is it not a very pregnant fact, that the Eastern churches, so independent of us, so long separated from the West,

so jealous for Antiquity, should even surpass us in their exaltation of the Blessed Virgin?" Once more he pointedly puts it to Pusey: "The height of our offending in our devotion to the Blessed Virgin would not look so great in your Volume as it does, had you not *deliberately* placed yourself on lower ground than your own feelings towards her would have spontaneously prompted you to take. I have no doubt you had some good reason for adopting this course, but I do not know it; what I do know is, that, for the Fathers' sake who so exalt her, you really do love and venerate her, *though you do not evidence it in your book*. I am glad then in this place to insist on a fact which will lead those among us, who know you not, to love you from their love of her, in spite of what you refuse to give her; and lead Anglicans, on the other hand, who do know you, to think better of us, who refuse her nothing, when they reflect that, if you come short of us, you do not actually go against us in your devotion to her." This is surely inimitable! The calm gentleness of the language in the above extracts did certainly not conceal from Pusey the gravity and severity of the rebuke administered, and it "drew" him.

The second volume of the *Eirenicon* is the reply to Father Newman on our topic. The third volume is also addressed to him, but its subject is foreign to this discussion. I am to consider the second. What an improvement on the original *Eirenicon*! It scarcely appears to be the work of the same author: for, (1) it contains *not one word throughout* calculated to give Catholics unnecessary pain, and (2) it speaks strongly on the greatness of our Blessed Lady, and on the veneration with which Christians should regard her. The very title-page mentions "the reverential love due to the ever-blessed Theotokos"—Mother of God. No wonder the Vicar did not refer to it in his last "Stricture." It was probably a revelation to him, and I have no doubt he took courage from it to deliver his "Sermon" so-called, of which, else, his hearers had been deprived. He cannot take Littledale and repeat the "Sermon." *Not one who listened to it ever before heard its like in any Anglican church in this city.*

Pusey begins his volume by admitting the truth of Father Newman's rebuke that he "deliberately" suppressed the expression of his own feelings towards Mary. These are his words: "My omission of any positive statements, in regard to the greatness of the Blessed Virgin, was partly owing, I suppose, to my not even imagining that any one could doubt my belief, since the doctrine expressed by that great title *Theotokos* (Mother of God), *is a matter of faith, an essential part of the doctrine of the Incarnation.*" I will now let Pusey furnish evidence of the truth of Dr. Newman's assertion that he was the last man who had a right to accuse Catholics of extravagant language towards Mary. He says: "(God), in all eternity, we both believe, foreordained her who was to be *Theotokos*, *Genetrix Dei*, the Mother of God. He, in time, created her; He endowed her with all those qualities, with which it was fitting that *she* should be endowed, in whom, 'When Thou tookest upon thee to deliver man, Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb.' It was indeed, in my young days, *a startling thought*, when it first flashed upon me that it must be true, that one of our nature which is the last and lowest of God's rational creation, was raised to a nearness to Almighty God above all the choirs of Angels or Archangels, Dominions or Powers, above the Cherubim, who seem so near to God, or the Seraphim with their burning love, close to His throne. Yet it was self-evident, as soon as stated, that she, of whom He deigned to take His Human Flesh, was brought to a nearness to Himself, above all created beings; that she stood single and alone, in all creation or all possible creations, in that, in her womb, He Who, in His Godhead, is Consubstantial with the Father, deigned, as to His Human Body, to become Consubstantial with her." Let your readers take in the sublimity of thought suggested by this quotation while I remark upon it. When Pusey was twenty-four years old he was elected a Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, along with Newman; at twenty-eight he was Canon of Christ Church and Royal Professor of Hebrew. How wonderful are the ways of God! Does the Vicar know the history of the foundation of Oriel? Perhaps he does, since he had the misfortune to proclaim Oxford his *Alma Mater*. Then he will

recognize the truth of my statement that: but for the place long held by the Blessed Virgin in the mind and heart of man, Pusey could not have been a Fellow of Oriel, for Oriel would never have existed; neither would he have been Canon of Christ Church nor Professor of Hebrew—neither would we have the *Eirenicon*, much less the Vicar's "Sermon," though *he* doubtless considers this equivalent to the honor meant for Mary by the men who founded Oriel College. Pusey confesses it was "a startling thought" when the idea of Mary's greatness "first flashed upon" him. The heart sickens at the thoughts called up by these words. A Catholic child lisps in the Archangelic salutation to Mary—"Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women," and the seal of the Incarnation is pressed upon his lips with his mother's milk; and to-day when the cathedral bell strikes the hours, Catholic hearts ring out in full diapason, in that same *Angelus*, their gratitude to God for the benefits of the Incarnation. But here we have a Fellow of *Mary's College*, a Canon of Christ Church, a Royal Professor of Hebrew, proclaiming to the world that before he entered his young manhood no *Ave* had ever been uttered by his voice to salute the Queen of Heaven—no earthly mother had ever taught his lisping lips to sing that song of the Innocents, "O Mary, how sweet is thy name!" It was not, however, the fault of Pusey's pure heart, and in the maturity of his great intellect, he tried to atone for his neglect. But how could it be otherwise in the Anglican Church a few years ago? It was not from the impure crew who founded the sect, with which he outwardly allied himself, that he could learn anything of her whom he now places so high. Semiramis or Cleopatra, Anne Boleyn or Queen Elizabeth filled a larger place in their thoughts than the Blessed Mother of God. How is it to-day among the rising generation in this city? Is that Blessed One anything more than a name?

LETTER XX.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—I continue my observations on the *Eirenicon*—second volume.

Pusey follows up the quotation on which I commented at the close of my last letter with this extract from a sermon of St. Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 447:

“ Traverse in thought, O man, the creation, and see if there is anything equal to or greater than the Holy Virgin, who bare God. Compass the earth, survey the sea, search the air, track the heavens in thought; consider all the invisible powers, and see whether there is any other such marvel in all creation. For the heavens declare the glory of God; the Angels serve with fear; the Archangels worship with trembling; the Cherubim, not sustaining, quiver; the Seraphim, flying around, approach not, and trembling, cry, ‘Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of hosts; heaven and earth are full of His praise.’ The clouds in awe became the chariot of the Resurrection; Hell in fear cast forth the dead;—count over the miracles, and admire the victory of the Virgin; for whom all creation hymned with fear and trembling, she alone inexplicably housed. *Blessed for her sake are all women. For womankind is no longer under a curse; for the race has received That wherefrom it shall surpass the Angels in glory. Eve is healed,*” etc.

These words remind one of the beautiful saying of the saintly Father Faber, from whom Pusey gratefully confesses he learned much: “There are cold, shallow controversies on earth, about our Lady’s greatness, while at this hour the great St. Michael is gazing on her throne with a rapture of astonishment, a delighted rapture which will grow to all eternity.” But this is simply another way of putting Pusey’s own words already given, and which are, in their turn, those of St. Proclus. Now, not only does Pusey heartily adopt and fully endorse the language of St. Proclus, but he proceeds to quote, in order to con-

cur in them, the glowing panegyrics of St. Cyril of Alexandria, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Theodotus and St. Basil. That is to say, he accepts as true and fitting to Mary *every word* in that magnificent panorama from the Greek Fathers, which I passed before the eyes of your readers in the fifth and sixth Letters of this *Rejoinder*. And, he makes this remark: "Doubtless, *any imaginations of ours must come short of the truth*, if we would picture to ourselves the superhuman, engraced beauty of the soul of her whom God vouchsafed to create, so alone in His whole creation, whose being ever lay in His eternal counsels, who must have been in His Divine Mind, when, in all eternity, He contemplated the way in which He should unite His rational creation to Himself, redeeming His fallen race; from whom He, who should be God and Man, was to derive His Human Flesh, and in His Sacred Childhood be subject to her."

Again: Pusey seemed to imply that Mary had no other part or position in the Incarnation than as its mere *physical* instrument—much the same part, as it were, that Judah or David may have had. Father Newman points out to him that the Fathers, on the contrary, from the very first, speak of her "as an intelligent, responsible cause of our Lord's taking flesh"; "her faith and obedience being accessories to the Incarnation, and gaining it as her reward." And Father Newman continues: "They (the Fathers) declare that she *co-operated in our salvation*, not merely by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon her body, but by specific holy acts, the effect of the Holy Ghost upon her soul; that, as Eve forfeited privileges by sin, so Mary earned privileges by the fruits of grace; that as Eve was a cause of ruin to all, Mary was a cause of salvation to all; that, as Eve made room for Adam's fall, so Mary made room for our Lord's reparation of it; and thus, whereas the free gift was not as the offence, but much greater, it follows that, as Eve *co-operated* in effecting a great evil, Mary *co-operated* in effecting a much greater good." Pusey transfers these words to his own pages in the *Eirenicon* and accepts their truth absolutely. "*Your words*," he says to Father Newman, "*express my belief also*." Here, then, I will partially anticipate the subject set

off for my next letter. Pusey had objected, in the first volume of the *Eirenicon*, to the title "Co-Redemptress" as applied to Mary. He did so, honestly I assume, because he had no adequate sense of what it implies, and supposing it to mean more than it does mean in the mouth of a Catholic. When his difficulty is removed by Father Newman's appeal to the Fathers, and to their explanation of the ways by which Mary "*co-operated in our salvation*," he says so like an honest man, and assures Father Newman that his words express his belief also, and, therefore, that Mary is justly styled—"Co-Redemptress." Let me for the instruction of thoughtful Protestants, who do not claim to be "true Catholics," enlarge on this. Their one obvious objection to the Catholic phrase, "Co-Redemptress," would be, that it denies the office of our dear Lord as Sole Redeemer. But this difficulty arises from their forgetting that there are two different kinds of *co-operation*; and that where the co-operation takes place by counsel, by instigation, by intercession, or by *a consent without which the work could not be accomplished*, the work still remains *exclusively* performed by its immediate agent. Thus it was Adam's sin which *exclusively* wrought man's fall; and yet Eve actively co-operated in that fall, because she incited Adam to do that which exclusively caused it. Moreover Eve's co-operation was *formal* and not merely *material*, because she knew she was exciting him to what involved man's ruin. In a parallel manner, Christ, our Redeemer, *alone* wrought man's *whole Redemption*; and yet Mary as truly and as formally co-operated in man's redemption, as Eve in man's fall. She co-operated, of course, in one sense by the circumstance of becoming His Mother. But, if this were all, it could not be said that she is the Co-operatrix of *Redemption* or Co-Redemptress, except in a purely material sense. At the solemn moment of the Annunciation, man's redemption depended on the alternative, whether she would or would not give her consent. And the consent which she gave was not merely to the being Mother of God—that would have been simply an unparalleled exaltation and dignity—but she consented to His work of redemption. She consented to undergo all that unspeakable suffering and anguish, which were involved

in her Son dying for the sins of the world. As Eve then *formally* co-operated in the fall, so Mary *formally* co-operated in the Redemption, and therefore, no one, whose faith on the doctrine of the Incarnation—the basilar idea of Christianity—is sound, can hesitate to call her, in the Catholic sense, “Co-Redemptress.”

When it is said, however, that man’s Redemption depended on Mary’s consent, it must not be forgotten that this involved no jeopardizing of God’s work ; because by His infallible grace He secured her consent without in any way violating her perfect liberty of will. Pusey says to Father Newman on this point: “(God), in all eternity, we both believe, foreordained her who was to be *Theotokos, Genetrix Dei, the Mother of God.*” So, too, it must not be forgotten, that the Co-Redemptress was herself redeemed ; and, I could illustrate the perfect harmony of these two facts by a very striking parallel between Eve’s relation to Adam and Mary’s to Jesus. Moreover, she was redeemed with a higher redemption than any other creature—a redemption of *preservation*, and not of *deliverance*; for she was redeemed by her Son’s foreseen death. To this I will refer later. So much have I felt obliged to say in justification of Mary’s title, “Co-Redemptress.” I have little fear of any reasoning on Christian principles, that would attempt to deprive her of it.

At present I am in an atmosphere of thought, which mention of the Vicar’s name cannot but cloud and sully, and I protest against the necessity of using it, for I feel it little short of a degradation. In the confused mass of citations which he takes from Pusey’s *first volume* for his last “Stricture” he includes—“Co-Redemptress.” So far he exhibits himself as a mere parasite to Pusey. Why did he not read in Pusey’s *second volume*, Father Newman’s explanation from the Fathers of the title “Co-Redemptress,” which Pusey himself so heartily accepted? Well, I believe he did read it, but I will give him the benefit of the milder alternative when I say that not malice, but pure ignorance of the matters he has undertaken to discuss, prevented his understanding it. That this is his mental condition your readers are long since convinced.

Why should not a Catholic feel it degrading, even under the pressure of duty and "priestly vows," to magnify such as he by noticing him at all? Why should so respectable a weapon as the "shillalah" be put to such ignominious uses?

Again. Pusey expressed his fears that there might be a difficulty in his adopting the great titles given by the Fathers to the Blessed Virgin because he had an "impression," he says, that their meaning was changed. This makes a Catholic smile. "I am *not* accusing," he assures Father Newman, "I only say, from what we wish to be exempt"—when he and his party became Catholics. Father Newman refers him to one of our prayer-books—"The Crown of Jesus,"—from which Pusey very fairly makes this extract, explaining our every-day use of the "great titles" given by the Fathers to Mary: "*Mother of Divine Grace*, because she is the parent of Him who is the Source and Author of all grace; *Seat of Wisdom*, as being replenished with this heavenly virtue, because she is the Mother of Him who is wisdom itself; *Cause of our Joy*, as being the instrument of that great blessing, which is the source of all our Christian consolations; *Tower of Ivory*, as being remarkable for the purity of innocence: ivory, by its whiteness, being the emblem of delicacy, whence that saying in the canticles, 'Thy neck is as a tower of ivory'; *Ark of the Covenant*, as being the parent of Him who is the Mediator of the new Covenant; *Gate of Heaven*, as being, again, mother of Him who has opened to us the gate of everlasting happiness; *Morning Star*, as being the harbinger of that bright Day which has brought immortality to light." To these beautiful titles let me add that other, "*Mater Misericordiæ*"—*Mother of Mercy*—because she is the parent of Him who is Mercy itself. By this will Mary now be honored and saluted in this city as the Patroness of the new hospital just erected by the zeal of our venerated Bishop. These explanations perfectly satisfied Pusey, and he says to Father Newman: "I am thankful to see in 'The Crown of Jesus,' to which you referred me, *expositions* of the great titles which are concentrated in the Litany of Loretto, *such as every Christian must receive*." Here again the Vicar displays "the hoof and tail." He copies Pusey's objection, says not a word

about the Catholic explanation and Pusey's satisfaction with it expressed in the foregoing words, and then charges "the Church of Rome with bringing in such a confusion of terms as to make it next to impossible for *true Catholics* to use innocently even the phraseology of the Catholic Fathers." My God! What a confession! And from apostates who dare lay claim to a divine commission to proclaim Thy truth to the world! Surely they have their reward: "*So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.*" The Vicar then adds: "In the same way (modern Romanists) have wrested the meaning of the term Advocate or Comforter in S. Irenæus, although the context and the general teaching of his writings *give them the lie direct.*" Only the "father of lies" could have inspired an utterance so transparently his offspring. Pusey would turn in his grave at the very thought of being made responsible for such blasphemies against honesty and truth.

To return to the *Eirenicon*. Having quoted from the Fathers, whose names I gave a moment ago, the most glowing language in exaltation of the blessed Mother that the human mind can conceive or human tongue utter, Pusey says: "Now, in all this, I suppose that there is nothing which any Anglican *who reflected on the term 'Theotokos' (Mother of God), would hesitate about (except that we are unaccustomed to mystical interpretations of Scripture).*" Yes; but how hard pressed Pusey would be to find "any Anglican who reflected on the term (Mother of God)" and applied it to Mary no man could be more painfully aware than himself. He knew but too well how it was him before, as he confessed, the idea of Mary's greatness "first flashed upon" his mind. "No man," candidly confesses that learned Protestant divine, Dr. Nevin—"No man whose tongue falters in pronouncing Mary *Mother of God* can be orthodox at heart on the article of Christ's person." Dr. Nevin was a Presbyterian, and the originator and exponent of the celebrated "Mercersburg System of Theology." Of course he had no pretensions to being a "true Catholic." Now, that Mary is "Theotokos," or Mother of God, is an integral part of the Catholic Faith fixed by the Third

General Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. The Anglican Bishop Burnet, in his Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, speaking of the time of the Council of Ephesus, says: "The whole world was then filled with very extravagant devotion to her (Mary)." Art. XXII. "Extravagant!" Ever the old shibboleth in the mouth of Bishop and Vicar. Nevertheless, the title "Mother of God," as Cardinal Newman beautifully writes, "carries with it no admixture of rhetoric, no taint of extravagant affection, —it has nothing else but a well-weighed, grave, dogmatic sense, which corresponds and is adequate to its sound. It intends to express that God is her son, as truly as any one of us is the son of his own mother. If this be so, what can be said of any creature whatever which may not be said of her? What can be said too much, so that it does not compromise the attributes of the Creator? It is this awful title, which both illustrates and connects together the two prerogatives of Mary, . . . her sanctity and her greatness. It is the issue of her sanctity; it is the origin of her greatness. What dignity can be too great to attribute to her who is as closely bound up, as intimately one, with the Eternal Word, as a mother is with a son? What outfit of sanctity, what fullness and redundancy of grace, what exuberance of merits must have been hers, when once we admit the supposition, which the Fathers justify, that her Maker really did regard those merits, and take them into account, when He condescended 'not to abhor the Virgin's womb'? . . . *Men sometimes wonder that we call her Mother of Life, of Mercy, of Salvation; what are all these titles compared to that one name—Mother of God?*"

The Anglican Book of Homilies declares that the Primitive Church is to be followed, and that the first Four General Councils are to be admitted as belonging to the Primitive Church. Pusey, on the contrary, says (*Eirenicon*, vol. 1, p. 93): "The Church of England receives the Six General Councils." At all events the Thirty-nine Articles state that the Book of Homilies contains "a godly and wholesome doctrine." Thus in theory, at least, Anglicans are bound to admit that Mary is Mother of God, because Ephesus, the *Third* General Council, defined it. But who ever heard an Anglican, lay or clerical,

so speak of her? I never did; and I can confidently affirm that no Anglican minister in this city ever before used it. We hear it for the first time from the Vicar, taught by Pusey, who says that "those other great terms," of the Fathers, "great as they were, were but weaker expressions of that one word Theotokos (Mother of God). They were so many colors evolved out of that central light." Here again he agrees with Father Newman.

I cannot better illustrate the truth of what I have said on this topic, than by transferring to your columns a correspondence between the new Bishop of Nova Scotia, the Rev. James Simpson, a Ritualist, and one Mr. Hall, evidently a genuine Anglican, in England. The comedy opens with a letter from Mr. Simpson to Bishop Courtenay, as follows:

HALIFAX, April 27th, 1888.

To the Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia:

MY LORD,—At the execution of William Millman, in the Charlottetown jail, on the 10th inst., I said the following committal:

"The Glorious Cross and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the mighty intercessions of the Mother of God and all the Saints, be between thee and thy ghostly enemies at this the hour of thy departure, and the blessing of God," etc., etc.

In consequence of this I have been charged with invoking the Virgin Mary, and making requests to her, thereby acting disloyally to the Church of England. I beg therefore to lay the matter before your Lordship, requesting that I may be allowed to publish this letter and your reply.

Believe me, your Lordship's obedient servant,

(Signed),

JAMES SIMPSON.

Your readers will notice that the "committal" used by Mr. Simpson is, almost *verbatim*, the prayer used by Catholics at the bedside of a departing soul, invoking in its behalf the intercession of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints. Bishop Courtenay replied as follows:

HALIFAX, 30th April, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR,—The words which you quote in your note of the 27th inst. are not an invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and therefore in using them you have not laid yourself open to the

charge, which you say has been brought against you, of acting disloyally to the Church of England. The church has not, so far as I am aware, asserted or taught that the children of God in the invisible world cease to pray for those on earth, or that such prayers are less efficacious than those which we offer for one another, and, therefore, the pious desire and aspiration that the whole of such prayers might be an aid to a criminal at the point of death for the defeating of his spiritual foes is not other than right and fitting. The one thing which, in my judgment, is liable to misconception, on the part of hasty and ignorant persons, is the special mention of the "intercessions of the Mother of God," which, to such people, might seem to imply an assumption of the mediatorship of our Blessed Lord, and an infringement of His right "who ever loveth to make intercession for us." While, therefore, I do not think you justly open to blame for the use of such a phrase, I would, if I were you, avoid it on any other occasion, as being likely to cause you to be misunderstood and wrongfully accused.

(Sig.)

F. NOVA SCOTIA.

Is not this appalling! Is it, or not, apostasy? The Bishop declares it to be "*right and fitting*" by "pious desire and aspiration" to ask the "prayers" of "the Mother of God and all the saints," "at the point of death, for the defeating of spiritual foes." Only "*hasty and ignorant persons*" can object to it, he assures Mr. Simpson. Again: it does not matter so much about the other "saints," but "the special mention of the intercession of the Mother of God" is peculiarly odious to those "hasty and ignorant persons" and detested by them. Since, then, to "such people" the asking for Mary's intercession "*might seem* to imply an assumption of the mediatorship of our Blessed Lord," what does the Bishop counsel Mr. Simpson? Does he, like St. Paul, urge him to declare boldly God's truth, "in season, out of season," to instruct those "hasty and ignorant persons," "to exhort in sound doctrine and convince the gainsayers," to "rebuke them sharply that they may be sound in the faith"? Not at all; he advises him to surrender and thus make life more pleasant for himself. Mr. Simpson must not "on any other occasion" "mention the intercession of the Mother of God"!

Again Bishop Courtenay says: "The church has not, so far as I am aware, asserted or taught that the children of God in the invisible world cease to pray for those on earth, or that such prayers are less efficacious than those which we offer for one another." Has the bishop ever read the "Homilies of the Church of England," the authoritative exposition of Anglican doctrine? In the "Second Part of the Sermon concerning Prayer," the invocation of the saints is *most distinctly prohibited*, on the express ground that the saints are "*not able to help us*," and the mere "desiring help at their hands" is represented as a treason against the majesty of Heaven. "Yet thou wilt object there that the saints in Heaven do pray for us, and that their prayer proceedeth of an earnest charity that they have towards their brethren on earth. Whereto it may be well answered, first, that no man knoweth whether they do pray for us or no." *Homilies*, pp. 296-301. *Ed. Oxford University Press.*

Last summer Bishop Courtenay went to England to attend the Lambeth Conference. While there an Anglican layman, Mr. Hall, brought him to task for his letter to Mr. Simpson endorsing his "Committal" prayer. The correspondence is so germane to my topic that I need not apologize for incorporating it here. The bishop replied to Mr. Hall as follows:

LAMBETH PALACE, 27th July, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR,—The whole controversy turns upon the interpretation of the words you complain of. You assert that they constitute an invocation of "the Blessed Virgin." I assert that they do not. I acquit Mr. Simpson on that ground alone. I am as well aware as you can be that our Church of England has in her articles condemned "invocation of saints," and as one of her officers I am ready to condemn such a thing too, but I cannot consent that you or any other member of the church should determine that certain words are what I contend they are not, and call in question my judgment as if the office of judge belonged to them and not to me. As to the term "Mother of God," you are aware, I suppose, that it is generally understood to be the equivalent of the Greek term "*Theotokos*," which was approved by a general council as "*Orthodox*" and to be used against heresy. *This is the only sense in which it is allowed by any Bishop of our church to be made use of by the clergy.* I am quite willing to be "the wrong man in the wrong

place" according to your wisdom, but then you see it is not to you that such judgment belongs, and I would advise you very earnestly to obtain sufficient knowledge of "theological terms," before you undertake to decide what is or is not false teaching according to the Church of England.

I remain yours truly,

(Sig.)

F. NOVA SCOTIA.

Twice in the Vicar's sermon he speaks of Mary as the "Holy Virgin Mother of God" and the "Blessed Mother of God," and again he calls her "the holy Theotokos." Was he only preaching against my "heresy" on the Incarnation? It was not any love for the Blessed Virgin, after all, that begat that "Sermon," since Bishop Courtenay says that he would not be allowed to speak of the "Mother of God" except "against heresy." How *can* he forgive the Bishop for exposing the false pretence, the "controversial trick," by which he sought to impose on your readers?

Mr. Hall's rejoinder to the Bishop's letter is as follows:

AINTREE, July 30th, 1888.

MY LORD,—The whole controversy does not turn on whether the Rev. J. Simpson's words to the dying criminal, viz.—"the mighty intercession of the Mother of God and all the Saints be between thee and thy ghostly foes," are an invocation of Saints, but rather whether our Church teaches any "Mother of God" or any such intercession. You say, "I am not aware that our Church teaches that the Saints in heaven do not intercede for those on earth." My Lord, is not this mere trifling? You know that the question is not what our Church does not teach, but what she does. If she does, why denounce its invocation as "a vain invention"? Why did she remove the "Mother of God" and every word about such intercession from our Prayer Book? My Lord, what can you know of an intercession of which our Prayer Book is wholly silent, and of which God Himself in His whole revelation says not one word? Is it on such grounds that you rush in and dare to dogmatize? Your Lordship denies that Mr. Simpson's words are an invocation of Saints. Yet his words being an undoubted prayer, they are either an invocation to the "Mother of God" or (the greater absurdity) of invoking God to invoke the Saints' intercession. This distinction is so fine that it reaches the dignity of a quibble. It needs no Episcopal Judge, but only a little common sense, to see that the Rev. gentle-

man appeals to this mighty intercession—was teaching the poor soul to invoke it. My Lord, you tell us as any Romanist would that the term “Mother of God” is orthodox because it is the English equivalent of the Greek word “Theotokos,” which word was sanctioned by a General Council. What, I ask, has your Lordship to do with General Councils, of which our Church says, Twenty-first Article: “Wherefore things ordained of them (General Councils) have neither strength nor authority unless they be taken out of Scripture.” Still less the packed Council of Ephesus which illegally and violently banished the Bishop of Constantinople because he would have none of this very word “Theotokos.” My Lord, can you find any “Theotokos” in the Greek Testament? Did any Apostle ever write it? Can you show its English equivalent anywhere except in the Romish Breviary? My Lord, you tell me that no Bishop permits the use of this term “Mother of God” except against heresy. Did Mr. Simpson use it against heresy? Yet you wrote to him—“that only the ignorant object to it,” and you hold him “blameless.” Which am I to believe? Can both be true? Is it even true that only the ignorant object? I may not be a master of the theological terms to which you refer, but I do understand plain English and can generally distinguish the real from the sham. On every side the laity see Bishops and clergy first foisting upon us (on false pretences) the teaching of Rome, next shamelessly avowing the fact. My Lord, depend upon it a day of reckoning must come between this outraged laity and these dishonest and law-breaking Bishops and clergy.

I am, my Lord,

Yours respectfully,

(Signed),

M. HALL.

Here ends the play. Who *would* not pity the Bishop? “Two chief reasons,” the Vicar says, “have tended to keep Romanism in England from displaying its true colors,” and the principal one he assigns is “the healthful influence of English church atmosphere with its *solid theology and devotions*.” Ha! Ha!! Ha!!! Your readers cannot get a better sample of both than is to be found in the foregoing correspondence. Mr. Simpson’s “devotions,” his “pious desires and aspirations” in aid of the dying are “nipped in the bud” by the Bishop, whose “*solid theology*” is, in turn, simply *dispersed* by a layman of his own communion. Such an exhibition, one might suppose, ought to prevent a man, who dares to think at all,

from remaining an Anglican for twenty-four hours. A private in the Salvation Army ranks is far more respectable from a logical standpoint. As for Ritualism—well, as Carlyle says, “it is a matter to strike one dumb.”

To return again to the *Eirenicon*. Your readers must wonder by what blind fatuity the Vicar was led to cite Pusey as a witness against us to support his own malicious, malignant, and disgustingly ignorant caricature of our devotion to the Blessed Mother of God. Pusey’s first volume, indeed, contains the strongest verbal expressions of that devotion in all their chilling nakedness. On these the Vicar bases his indictment. And yet does Pusey denounce the Catholic Church as “apostate,” “infidel,” “impious,” and “idolatrous”? Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, in the second volume he says to Father Newman: “I have often (though you will smile perhaps at the advocacy) had to defend the Roman Church against being idolatrous, and *that*, on the ground of this and the like language.” Father Newman had expostulated with Pusey, on his first volume, in these words: “Have you not been touching us on a very tender point in a very rude way? . . . Have you even hinted that our love for her is anything else than an abuse? Have you thrown her one kind word yourself all through your book? I trust so, but I have not lighted upon one. And yet I know you love her well. . . . Is not the effect of what you have said to expose her to scorn and obloquy, who is dearer to us than any other creature?” Pusey, at the close of his letter, replies to this last question: “God forbid! I have not spoken, I trust, anything which could be construed into derogation of *her*, who is the Mother of Jesus, my Lord and God. . . . They are not any expressions of love, or reverence, or admiration, which I have stated to be our difficulties. I know not how any could be too great, if they had not a dogmatic basis, beyond what we believe God to have revealed. And here, too, if God had clearly revealed, what some among you believe, there would be no further question, just as we believe that God has given authority to the priest to pronounce forgiveness in His Name, and that He Himself confirms to the penitent what is so pronounced in His Name, do not think

that the priest comes between us and God ; and we know that we ourselves are wrongly accused of ‘ substituting the Sacraments for Christ,’ *i.e.*, the modes of His operation, or, in the Holy Eucharist, His Presence, for Himself. . . . Plainly, we could not love too much *her*, from whom Jesus vouchsafed to receive a mother’s care, who loved Him, the All-Holy and her Redeemer too, as no other mother could love her son ; whom He loved with a Divine, but also with a Deified human love ; love with which no other son could love his mother. The love of the mother and Son were essentially different from all other love, because He was her Son after the Flesh, but also Almighty God. And that same love must continue on now, only that her God-enabled power of love, in the beatific vision of His Godhead, must be unspeakably intensified.” Your readers cannot wonder, after words like these, that I expressed my *belief* that Dr. Pusey “*died* in the bosom of the Catholic Church.” He continues : “ They are cold words to say, that it is not the amount of love for the Mother of our Redeemer and our God (how could it be ?), but the mode of its expression to which any of us have objected.” Your readers already know how many of Pusey’s own misconceptions on this very point were removed by Father Newman. Indeed I believe not one was left. I propose, after my own humble fashion, to do the same office for those honest, fair-minded, and thoughtful Protestants here, whose ordinary prejudices may have been deepened by the ignorance, dishonesty, and malice of a pseudo-“ Father.”

LETTER XXI.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—If it were my sole desire to silence the Vicar by a *reductio ad absurdum*, it could not be necessary to add another word to the testimony to Catholic truth adduced by his own

witnesses. But this is neither all nor any part of my desire ; I wish simply to do whatever may lie in my power, under the circumstances in which I write, to dissipate certain prejudices, which exist, and have been excited, in the minds of sincere Protestants, by the particular construction of the *language* in which Catholic piety clothes those feelings of devotion towards the Mother of God, which I have, theologically, so irrefragably justified. Devotion is one thing, theology is another ; but they must not be separated. It is true that they have an individuality of their own, and claim separate apartments—one in the head, the other in the heart. But they are twin sisters, and dwell in one house.

I closed my last letter with the following quotation from Pusey : “ It is not the amount of love for the Mother of our Redeemer (how could it be ?) *but the mode of its expression to which any of us have objected.*” And the Vicar, speaking of the language of his extracts from St. Liguori and the Raccolta, says : “ Herein we find expressions of worship and supplication such as Christians are wont to present only to God or the Incarnate Son or the Holy Spirit.”

Now, this is no longer finding fault with our doctrine and practice, but simply with the *word* by which it is expressed. Yet, the real meaning of our devotion to the Blessed Virgin is so clearly defined among us, and so plainly explained for the benefit of Protestants, that it is certainly no fault of ours if somebody chooses to be so blind or so obstinate, so ignorant or so malicious as to misunderstand or misinterpret our meaning. I propose, then, to address myself just now to the argument against us drawn by the Vicar from the similarity of language used by Catholics when addressing God and when addressing the Blessed Virgin. The objection is so utterly imbecile and worthless that I confess to a feeling of disgust in facing it ; but for the sake of that multitude of “ hasty and ignorant persons ” I will give an easy solution.

In order to show that we give God’s glory to His Blessed Mother because of words expressive of our hope and confidence in her intercession, my opponent ought to prove, first of all, that our language is fully adequate to our idea of God, and

secondly, that that idea is fully adequate to its Divine Object. For until he has proved these two propositions, which are evidently *false*, it may be true that whilst on earth we are forced by the infirmity of our nature to give God *only* that glory which is due to His saints, if even that. And that this is nearer to the truth than the Protestant objection, will appear on careful examination. It is *impossible* for us to think of God or Heaven otherwise than under the subjective conditions of human thought. Our conceptions of Him are, and cannot keep from being, anthropomorphic; that is to say, they are conditioned by the essential limits of our nature. It may, in a sense, be said that we *incarnate* God by a necessity of our intellectual and spiritual existence. "*Omnis cognitio est secundum modum cognoscentis*," observes the Angelic Aquinas. We all start, as children, with most human views of divine things, and the vast multitude of men remain all their lives children in this respect: children in understanding, although in virtue they may attain "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Even the inspired writers, when speaking of God and His operations, could only make themselves intelligible by using expressions which, if taken to the letter, would sanction the Anthropomorphite heresy. Yet how unspeakably unjust it would be for a cold rationalist or an ignorant and conceited Ritualist to accuse them of entertaining a narrow or materialized conception of the Divine Nature. If we are ever to speak of God, it must be with the sorrowful consciousness how wretchedly our conception of Him falls beneath the reality, and how miserably our warmest language falls below even that poor conception. We *would* speak more gloriously of Him, but we *cannot*. Human language has an essentially physical, sensual, materialistic character, or as St. Thomas Aquinas puts it: "*Verba sequuntur non modum essendi qui est in rebus, sed modum essendi secundum quod in nostra cogitatione sunt*." So too if we would express our worship externally. It has been the custom in most ages and countries to express the respect due to superiors by prostrations to the earth. God has in Holy Scripture expressly sanctioned this honor when paid to His servants. The Sunamite

woman prostrated before Eliseus. Joshua "fell on his face and did worship" before the Angel of the Lord's Host. Daniel fell upon his face before God's Angel. Yet what more *could* we do to express the worship due to God alone? We are tied down to earth—the Finite cannot grasp the Infinite. (See *Fortnightly Review*, July, 1887: Art. "The Higher Theism," by the learned Catholic writer, W. S. Lilly; also, the *Nineteenth Century*, August, 1888: Art. "What is Left of Christianity?" by the same.) All this, of course, is a mere truism. Yet the Protestant objection, put by the Vicar in his ignorance, involves its denial. Once for all then I maintain, that, as a matter of fact, whenever we have to address God, whether by way of petition, or of thanks, or of expressing our love, hope, or confidence in Him, it is impossible for us, by reason of our imperfection, to do this in a way which might not legitimately be observed in addressing our fellow creatures. But what I have said respecting our incapacity of attaining to an adequate conception of God, or of worthily expressing our worship of Him, applies equally to the Saints, and more especially to the Queen of Saints. We never can form the remotest idea of her glory and exaltation: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love Him" (1 Cor. ii. 9). We need not, therefore, be apprehensive of too highly exalting her. We cannot possibly love her or honor her more than God, our Saviour and great Exemplar, does; we need not, therefore, be afraid of loving or honoring her too much. We cannot realize the full value of her intercession; we need not, therefore, be afraid of placing too much confidence in it.

I am, of course, aware that there are several of the ordinary, ridiculous objections to what I have just said, but they vanish if only looked at. It may, for instance, be said that a person loves the Blessed Mary too much if he loves her more than he loves God. Not at all. He sins indeed very grievously, but not from his excess of love for her (he cannot possibly love her enough), but from his want of love for God. Or it may be said that a person who feels sure that the Mother of God will obtain from her Son the pardon of his sins, however careless

he may be of his own salvation, has too much confidence in her intercession. By no means; he is guilty of the sin of presumption, precisely in the same way as if he hoped that *God Himself* would pardon him whether he repented or not. No one would, in the latter case, say that he had too much confidence in God's power—which would mean that God's power was less than he estimated it.

This will suffice, for the present, on this point; but I proceed to ask, who are to blame for the truly pitiable misunderstanding, and strange perversion of the meaning of the language of such of our devotional books as St. Liguori's "Glories of Mary" and the "Raccolta"? Protestants themselves. The chief reason is because they examine them as Protestants, and not as Catholics. Our devotional books are written for Catholics, and not for Protestants; and therefore to be understood aright, they must be looked at from a Catholic and not from a Protestant point of view. This is surely the dictate of common sense. Let me apply it to the subject in hand.

A Protestant has learned from his childhood to believe that the devotion which Catholics pay to the Mother of God, if not absolutely idolatrous, has at least an idolatrous tendency. Hence the term Mariolatory, which is so common among "hasty and ignorant" Protestants, who may not have another *religious* idea beside. This early training is more and more confirmed in proportion as he becomes familiar with Protestant literature in which Catholic doctrine is almost invariably misrepresented. Thus he naturally comes to look with suspicion and distrust on the language in which the great dignity and the high prerogatives of the ever Blessed Mother of God, are set forth by Catholic writers. By a lamentable and quasi-satanic perversion of his natural instincts, he insensibly acquires such a habit of mind, that, while he may love God, he can feel nothing but coldness and indifference (to speak mildly) towards her whom Jesus Christ loved and honored as the first of creatures. In theory he will not, and cannot deny that Mary was adorned by God with the plenitude of every virtue; and then, when she stood before Him "full of grace," that He came down from Heaven, and having dwelt for nine months in her sacred body, lived

with her for thirty years in her home at Nazareth and "was subject" to her. And yet, in practice, he seems to think that every word of praise which is given to Mary is so much taken from God. A Protestant, therefore, is little disposed to make any allowance for the ardor of devotional feeling towards the Blessed Virgin. He *professes* to be jealous, forsooth, for the honor of God when he sees a Catholic rush eagerly to Mary, as a child to the embraces of its mother, and when he hears the fond endearments that pass between them, he measures every word, and balances every phrase by the uncompromising rules of grammar and logic. In a word, the ordinary Protestant is so matter-of-fact as not to make allowance for the language of hyperbole; and so untheological, as not to have any clear intuition of the mystery of the Divine condescension in the Incarnation, of the union of the Godhead and Manhood in One Divine Person, of the relation of the great Mother of God to the "Living God who has purchased us to Himself by His own Blood," and of the mystery of human exaltation, by which the redeemed and she who is the first and best of the redeemed, "are seated in Heavenly places with Christ" on that throne which He shares with His Eternal Father.

Now, far different is the tone of mind in which a Catholic takes up his book of devotions. To begin with, he has a range of spiritual conceptions which are as remote from the twinkling, phosphorescent philosophy of the Vicar as from the mental vision of the rudest boor. From the time that his infant lips have been able to lisp the name of Mary, he has been taught that, though she is the peerless Queen of Angels and Saints, she is yet but a creature, and therefore, in nature and dignity, infinitely inferior to the Creator. It is consequently to him a first principle that the honor which is due to the Blessed Virgin is not only very different *in degree*, but also wholly different *in kind*, from the honor which is due to God. All this has been engraved on his mind from earliest infancy, as the fixed, unalterable teaching of the Catholic Church. If then, amid the ardent effusions of saintly, devotional writers, he meets with phrases and expressions which to Protestants might seem ambiguous or exaggerated, he is not

disturbed. He, instinctively, understands these according to the accurate theology and whole living tradition of Catholic faith in which he has been taught from his mother's knee. He holds the key to the true interpretation. Such language, when considered in itself, scrutinized through the medium of Protestant prejudice and ignorance, and measured by the inexorable rules of grammar and logic, is ambiguous to Protestants; but it is not ambiguous to Catholics for whom it is written. It is sometimes exaggerated, if you will; but the language of sentiment and feeling is often exaggerated, and yet is not, on that account, false: it must be always understood according to the known opinions of the writer, and of those for whom he writes. Again, a Catholic knows that the warm feelings of saintly men, when contemplating the sublime holiness of Mary, must sometimes outrun their powers of speech; that they will not always stop to pick and choose their language with the calm indifference of a mathematician; and that very often their only thought is to give the fullest expression to the depth and tenderness of their devotion. In a word, the Catholic heart is so attuned to praise and venerate his Redeemer's dearest mother, that it is little inclined to measure her glories with the line and plummet of verbal precision, or to express them through the chilling medium of chemical or algebraic formulas. Nevertheless, "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread," and a ritualistic vicar, with the aid of a "yard stick," will undertake to determine anything from the altitude and angles of an Archangel's wing down to the cut of a vestment. The great St. Bernard is called the "Last of the Fathers." Bishop Kingdon said he was "a very devout soul." He had a great devotion to the Blessed Virgin. The Vicar copies from Saint Liguori language attributed to St. Bernard, and straightaway characterizes it as "abominable"! Think of it! The "Priest of the Mission Chapel" sitting in judgment on St. Bernard! Truly: "The sensual man perceiveth not these things that are of the Spirit of God: for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand" (1. Cor. ii. 14).

Let me sum up my reflections on this head in the words of the greatest religious intellect that to-day uses the English

tongue, and one of the purest hearts in Christendom. Father Newman wrote :

“Religion acts on the affections. . . . *Their* object engrosses them, and they see nothing else. And of all passions love is the most unmanageable; nay more, I would not give much for that love which is never extravagant, which always observes the proprieties, and can move about in perfect good taste under all emergencies. What mother, what husband or wife, what youth or maiden in love, but says a thousand foolish things, in the way of endearment, which the speaker would be sorry for strangers to hear; yet they are not on that account unwelcome to the parties to whom they are addressed. Sometimes by bad luck they are written down, sometimes they get into the newspapers; and what might be even graceful when it was fresh from the heart and interpreted by the voice and the countenance, presents but a melancholy exhibition when served up cold for the public eye. *So it is with devotional feelings. Burning thoughts and words are as open to criticism as they are beyond it.* What is abstractedly extravagant may in particular persons be becoming and beautiful, and only fall under blame when it is found in others who imitate them. When it is formalized into meditations or exercises, it is as repulsive as love-letters in a police report. Moreover, even holy minds readily adopt and become familiar with language which they would never have originated themselves, when it proceeds from a writer who has the same objects of devotion as they have; and, if they find a stranger ridicule or reprobate supplication or praise which has come to them so recommended, they feel it as keenly as if a direct insult were offered to those to whom that homage is addressed. In the next place, what has power to stir holy and refined souls is potent also with the multitude. . . . I say, then, when once we have mastered the idea, that Mary bore, suckled, and handled the Eternal in the form of a child, what limit is conceivable to the rush and flood of thoughts which such a doctrine involves? What awe and surprise must attend upon the knowledge, that a creature has been brought so close to the Divine Essence?

“It was the creation of a new idea, and of a new sympathy, of a new faith and worship when the holy Apostles announced that God had become Incarnate; then a supreme love and devotion to Him became possible, which seemed hopeless before that revelation. This was the first consequence of their preaching. But, besides this, a second range of thoughts was opened on mankind, unknown before, and unlike any other, as soon as it was understood that that Incarnate God had a mother. The second idea is perfectly distinct from

the former, and does not interfere with it. He is God made low, she is a woman made high. . . . *He who charges us with making Mary a divinity is thereby denying the divinity of Jesus. Such a man does not know what divinity is.* Our Lord cannot pray for us as a creature prays, as Mary prays; He cannot inspire those feelings which a creature inspires. To her belongs, as being a creature, a natural claim on our sympathy and familiarity, in that she is nothing else than our fellow. She is our pride—in the poet's words, 'Our tainted nature's solitary boast.' We look to her without any fear, any remorse, any consciousness that she is able to read us, judge us, punish us. Our heart yearns towards that pure Virgin, that gentle Mother, and our congratulations follow her as she rises from Nazareth and Ephesus, through the choirs of angels, to her throne on high, so weak, yet so strong; so delicate, yet so glorious; so modest, and yet so mighty. She has sketched for us her own portrait in the Magnificat. He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaid; for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. 'He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away.' I recollect the strange emotion which took by surprise men and women, young and old, when, at the coronation of our present Queen, they gazed on the figure of one so like a child, so small, so tender, so shrinking, who had been exalted to so great an inheritance and so vast a rule, who was such a contrast in her own person to the solemn pageant which centred in her. Could it be otherwise with the spectators, if they had human affections? And did not the All-wise know the human heart when He took to Himself a Mother? Did He not anticipate our emotion at the sight of such an exaltation in one so simple and so lowly? If He had not meant her to exert that wonderful influence in His church, which she has in the event exerted, I will use a bold word, He it is who has perverted us. If she is not to attract our homage, why did He make her solitary in her greatness amid His vast creation? If it be idolatry in us to let our affections respond to our faith, He would not have made her what she is, or He would not have told us that He had so made her; but, far from this, He has sent His prophet to announce to us, 'A virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel,' *and we have the same warrant for hailing her as God's Mother, as we have for adoring Him as God.*"

So much in explanation of the *ordinary* language used by devotional writers.

LETTER XXII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I come now to another Guy Fawkes dressed up by the Vicar with the old clothes he borrows from Pusey. His mind (or what he may be pleased to call his mind) seems to be utter chaos. There is some sort of order in Pusey's manner of putting his objections, but his parasite simply "*dumps*" them into your columns in bewildering confusion. I propose now to consider the objection based on the application to Mary of *Scriptural* language. Pusey complained, in the *first* volume of the *Eirenicon*, that there was a studied identification of the Blessed Virgin with her Divine Son, because the church has applied to her passages from the Book of Proverbs and of Wisdom, which have been interpreted and understood to refer to Christ. In the *second* volume, however, Pusey confesses that Anglicans "are not accustomed to mystical interpretations of Scripture." The Vicar simply varies Pusey's language and falsely says, "There is not a title of Jesus Christ but has been adopted for Mary." But let this malicious charge stand with Pusey's more honest complaint. It will make the supposed difficulty more telling and complete. Again he says that we "substitute Mary's name for 'Jesus' or 'God' in quotations from Scripture."

Now this objection is deserving of all attention, and I am happy to answer, as well as to instruct, this Oxford sciolist. Such application of language, I claim, is perfectly legitimate, according to sound hermeneutical principles. I begin, then, by laying down a general principle of Bible hermeneutics, which has received the sanction of the greatest names among the Fathers and Doctors of the church. And I give it in the concise and simple words of St. Jerome: "Each sentence, syllable, dot, in the Divine Scriptures is full of meanings." Or as St. Gregory the Great tells us: "The sacred writings are rightly compared to the Sea; for in them there are huge bil-

lows of meanings, wave upon wave of senses." The Bible is not like other books, nor can we treat, use, or interpret it, as we do other books. When we read a classical author, Greek or Latin, we know that there is one sense; and our undivided effort is to find out what that sense is. But the Sacred Scriptures are an unfathomable ocean of truth, because they are God's word. The whole theological genius of the church will never to the end of time exhaust their fullness. One meaning lies hidden in another—the implicit in the explicit, the spiritual in the historical, the anagogical in the moral. And these several meanings—distinct, but not opposed—extending the representative power of the Divine Idea to many objects, yet welling out from the depths of the Uncreated Unity, and returning to it again—beautifully multiform, but perfectly harmonious—ever developing into new mysteries, yet ever living pure and immutable in the Eternity of their Source and Light, are (if they have the due sanction of the illuminating and directing Spirit, Whose it is to bring all things to remembrance in the Church), of equal weight, equal authority, equal truth and certainty. And thus, one text may be adduced to illustrate, or even prove, two or more distinct truths without impairing the force of the proof in the one case or the other. Thus, for instance, St. Paul quotes the words of the Psalmist—Ps. ii. 7—"Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee," in proof of three distinct mysteries. For, in one place—Acts xiii. 33—he interprets them of our Lord's Resurrection; in another—Heb. i. 5—apparently of His Divine generation as the Son of God; and in a third—Heb. v. 5—of His human generation in the womb of the Blessed Virgin.

The learned Piazza has explained this law of Scriptural exegesis with so much clearness that I beg to quote his words at length. He says:

"We must distinguish between two other literal senses of Holy Scriptures—one which is explicit and express, the other which is implicit and virtual. For the genuine and literal sense of Scripture not only includes whatever is clearly and expressly stated in the precise words of Scripture whether understood in their proper or in their metaphorical meaning, but also whatever is implicitly and virtually

contained in them, as well as all the legitimate consequences we can draw from them. For the Holy Ghost, Who knows most fully all that these words mean and imply, wished to convey these senses to us. . . . Our Lord certainly adduced Scripture evidence of this sort to convince the Sadducees of the Resurrection of the dead. For as they did not admit the books in which this dogma is expressly taught, but only the Pentateuch, our Lord quoted *Exodus* iii. 6, where this truth is only virtually and implicitly contained. 'Have you not read about the Resurrection of the dead,' He asked, 'what was said by God when He said, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' He then added this brief explanation: 'He is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' The force of the argument lies in this, that God did not say, 'I have been or I was, but I am the God,' &c. As God then is not the God of the dead, but of the living, it follows that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are still living as far as their noblest part is concerned, namely, their souls. And so the Resurrection of the dead is proved against the Sadducees, who denied it, because they denied that the soul was immortal. And yet our Lord maintains that these words were said by God of the Resurrection of the dead, for He tells the Sadducees: 'Have you not read about the Resurrection of the dead what was said by God, when He said,' &c.

"The Church, taught by her great Master, used the Scriptures in the same way."

So speaks Piazza about the virtual or implicit meaning. Now come nearer home. He also speaks of the *mystical meaning* (to which Anglicans are so unaccustomed, God help them!), in these words:

"As the *literal* sense of Holy Scripture is that which is immediately expressed by the words, so, the *mystical* sense is that which is denoted by the things signified in the words of Scripture. Moreover, it is certain that this mystical sense (if it is truly the mystical sense, and not a mere accommodation) is a true, proper, and genuine meaning of Holy Scripture no less than the literal; and is equally intended by Its principal Author, the Holy Ghost, and therefore, considered in itself, it has the same authority and weight. . . . And we may be perfectly sure of the truth of this mystical sense, if it is either so explained in some other part of Scripture, or handed down by the consent of the Church or concluded evidently from reason."

Let me here make one observation, lest this principle should

be misunderstood. It must not for one moment be supposed, that we are at perfect liberty to invent meanings for ourselves, and then to use texts, accommodated to this meaning, in confirmation of a particular doctrine, according to our private judgment. But what Catholics maintain is this. If a second meaning, or even a secondary meaning, has been attached to the words by the traditional teaching of the church, or in the writings of her Fathers and Doctors generally, in such case it would be hardly possible to deny that the passage, so understood, might be produced in confirmation of a question of doctrine. Here Piazza again says: "If there should be an evident agreement about the mystical as about the literal sense, the one and the other would be equally efficacious as an argument; since the Holy Spirit is the Author alike of both." And more germanely to our present topic he says: "There is nothing to hinder our understanding the same passages to have been spoken of Mary in a literal sense, which are also understood of Christ and the Church in a literal sense; since She is the most noble member of the Church, and is united to Christ by that close nearness which exists between a Mother and her Son. Moreover, it has been the custom of the Church to apply to Mary many things which are predicted in the Scriptures of Christ and the Church." In support of his assertion Piazza quotes celebrated theologians.¹

Now, applying these principles to the objections under consideration, let me ask your candid and thoughtful readers: Is there any danger of a gradual identification of Mary with her Divine Son to be apprehended, from a use of the Holy Scriptures consecrated by grave authority, and the long-established practice of the Church herself? Will devout and humble contemplation ever run the risk of confounding the Wisdom of the Son of God with the communicated gift of wisdom, which Mary received of God's pure goodness, and for the merits of Jesus—her Son and Saviour? Has any one Priest in the Catholic Church for these centuries during which her Offices have been in constant use, ever equalled Mary with

¹ See Father Harper, l. c.

God, because, in the appointed Lessons, Holy Church has taught him to see, in the words of Inspired Wisdom, a picture of the Mother as well as of the Son? Why should not my Protestant objectors have the same misgivings, when St. Paul calls the church or congregation of the faithful by the very name of Christ Himself? (1 Cor. xii. 12). If there is no peril in one case why should there be in the other? I must then urge upon honest, thoughtful Protestants, and repeat for their benefit, what has been said a hundred times before, that such a notion could only arise in the minds of men who are total strangers to the inner life of the Catholic Church. It is a dream, a nightmare, a phantom evoked perhaps by prejudice and the ignorant ravings of a Vicar, but which a month's experience in the bosom of the Church would suffice to dissipate.

Once more. The difference between the Catholic Church and the modern schools of heresy is remarkably apparent in their respective treatment of the Sacred Scriptures. Protestantism, professing to regard the inspired volume with the deepest reverence, is continually by its acts giving the lie to its professions. For, not contented with rejecting a large portion of the Holy Scriptures as being in its opinion unworthy of Divine inspiration; not satisfied with setting aside the acknowledged standard and rules of interpretation, and with rejecting, whenever it suits its convenience, the literal sense of the Sacred Words, the true Protestant spirit treats the Bible, as it does everything else that is holy, with a cold, hard, and scornful scepticism. Where there is *mystery* the literal meaning is denied and explained away. Where certain expressions of Scripture appear to fall in with and to favor its own peculiar conventionalities, those expressions are explained with a rigid severity totally inconsistent with the laws of true interpretation. The Bible, in such hands, is either an armory of Protestant Polemics, or a collection of dry, barren, pharisaical rules of conduct, imposing burdens upon men's consciences which God Almighty never willed to impose, and inculcating a rigid and constrained code of morals, as unlike the sweet, cheerful, and holy law of Christ as the light of the sun is un-

like the darkness of night. There are, of course, cases of exception to this statement, since individuals, the Vicar assures us, are very often much better than the system which has formed and trained them; but the statement itself is true. Protestantism, even when decked out by ritualistic "Fathers" in the lion's skin of stolen Catholic ritual, lacks love, generosity, and depth of feeling; and these deficiencies are remarkably manifested in its use and interpretation of the Scriptures. The Catholic religion, on the other hand, brings to the study of the Sacred Volume all that warmth and all that devotional feeling which is the marked characteristic of its inner life. It is not afraid of the Inspired Volume, of which it is both the witness and the keeper, therefore it admits, defends, and protects the *literal* sense of the Bible. It believes the Sacred Scriptures to be the Words of Him whose Wisdom is infinite, and whose actions, and whose dealings with men are themselves full of mystery, hence its *threefold* use of Scripture—according to the *letter* (literal), according to the *figure* (mystical), and by ACCOMMODATION. I have already spoken of the first two. I ask your readers' attention to some remarks on the third, in its application to the Blessed Mary.

At all times the Church has applied the words of Scripture to other objects besides those which are intended by the inspired writers themselves; not, indeed, meaning by this to supersede the literal and mystical senses, or to convey the impression that such ecclesiastical applications are really entertained in Scripture, or rest upon its authority; but simply intending to point out some *quality* some *virtue* or some *prerogative*, in the object of this new application, which, in its own judgment, is suitably and aptly expressed by certain words of the sacred volume. This is what is called *accommodation*. No practice is more common in every department of literature and speech—none more innocent in itself. Thus when the illustrious Cardinal Baronius, to declare he had no "*learned friends*," said of his unaided labor in compiling his Ecclesiastical Annals, "I have trodden the wine-press alone," he used the words of Isaias, in reference to Christ, in an *accommodated* sense. We have the example of our Divine

Lord Himself—Matt. iv. 4; also of St. Paul, Acts xxviii. 25–28. For other examples of *accommodation* of words of the Old Testament in the New I refer to Matt. xiii. 35; Psal. xxviii. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 24; Matt. viii. 17; Isa. iii. 4. The piety of the church has made the Scripture its daily food of meditation. When it seeks to express itself in a suitable manner about the glory of God, or the gifts of His Saints, it naturally employs the very words of the Holy Scripture itself. It is upon this principle that all its sacred offices have been constructed. The Introit, the Offertory, and the Communion in the Mass, are almost always passages of Scripture *accommodated* by the church to the particular festivals of the day. So also are the Antiphons and Versicles, and other portions of the offices contained in the Breviary. In a word, the natural language of the church is the language of Scripture, and it employs this language, either (1) to state a truth, or doctrine, or fact, as the holy volume literally contains or states it; or (2) to teach some truth, fact, or doctrine, of which the type and emblem is to be found in the Old Testament Scriptures, and is there designed by the Holy Ghost; or finally (3) to illustrate some fact or truth in the kingdom of grace, by words which most appropriately apply to the fact or truth, although the inspired Author did not intend to make such application of them, when he first committed them to writing. Such, then, is the nature of *accommodation*—the pious application of sacred words to other objects than those designed by the sacred writers.

Pusey says: “Any imaginations of ours must come short of the truth, if we would picture to ourselves the superhuman, engraced beauty of the soul of (Mary).” Precisely. Fully realizing this truth the Fathers and Christian writers of the Church delighted to apply to the Blessed Virgin texts and parts of the Sacred Scriptures in which they seemed to find epithets and images that expressed in the fittest terms their own idea of her supernatural prerogatives. They applied to her in an especial way the *Song of Solomon*, which according to Theologians has only a mystical, and no literal sense; and in this mystical sense, it relates either to the union of the

soul with God, or to the union of the Church with Christ. But as Mary is the most excellent member of the Church, on whom is conferred in its fullness the grace that is partially bestowed upon others, it is not unnatural to infer that all which is expressed in this Canticle with respect to the magnificence, the beauty, the order and sanctity of the Church, applies in the highest degree to her own supereminent perfection. It would take too much space to show by quotations how extensively accommodations of this Canticle to Mary occur in the Patristic and Ecclesiastical writings of antiquity. They are to be found in the Mozarabic and Coptic Missals, the Hymns of the Greek Church, the Missals and Breviaries of the Latin Church, in various other ecclesiastical monuments, and in the writings of St. John Damascene, Tarasius, Methodius, Modestus of Jerusalem, St. Ephrem, Psellus, Anastasius of Antioch, St. Germanus, St. Anselm, St. Bernard and most *mediæval* writers. In these we find the most beautiful passages of this mystic song directly applied to the most holy Virgin. She is the "Flower of the Field," and "the Lily of the Valley." She it is, of whom it is said, "Behold thou art fair, O my love, behold thou art fair." It is Mary whom the beloved calls to "Arise, make haste, my love, my dove, my beautiful one, and come." It is Mary whose magnificence and whose sanctity diffuses, as it were, a fragrance of the sweetest savor over the whole world. "Who is she that goeth up by the desert as a pillar of smoke, of aromatic spices, of myrrh, and frankincense, and of all the powder of the perfumer?" It is her beauty which enraptures the beloved, and constrains him to exclaim, "How beautiful art thou, my love, how beautiful art thou!" "Thou art all fair, O my love; and there is no stain in thee." "Who is she that cometh forth as the morning rising, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army in battle array?"

In addition to the Song of Solomon, the Church has *accommodated* to the Blessed Mother other portions of the sacred volume, and in particular different passages from the Books of Proverbs, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus, besides several of the Psalms of David. These passages are familiar to all who are

acquainted with the offices of the Blessed Virgin in the Roman Breviary, and with the Lessons appointed to be read in them upon the principal Festivals. They are to be found chiefly in the 8th chapter of Proverbs, the 24th chapter of Ecclesiasticus, and the 1st and 4th chapters of Wisdom.

I have space but for that very beautiful application to Mary of the 24th chapter of Ecclesiasticus. Wisdom there says of herself: "I came out of the mouth of the Most High. . . . Then the Creator of all things commanded, and said to me, and He that made me rested in my tabernacle. And He said to me, let Thy dwelling be in Jacob, and thy inheritance in Israel, and *take root in my elect*. . . . And so was I established in Sion, and in the holy city likewise I rested, and my power was in Jerusalem. And I took root in an honorable people, and in the portion of my God His inheritance, and my abode is in the full assembly of the Saints. I was exalted like a cedar in Libanus, and as a cypress tree on Mount Sion. I was exalted like a palm tree in Cades, and as a rose plant in Jericho. As a fair olive tree in the plains, and as a plane tree by the water in the streets, was I exalted. . . . As the vine I have brought forth a pleasant odor, and my flowers are the fruit of honor and riches. . . . In me is all grace of the way and of the truth; in me is all hope of life and of virtue. Come over to me all ye that desire me, and be filled with my fruits. For my spirit is sweet above honey, and my inheritance above honey and the honeycomb." This sublime description of Wisdom is *accommodated* to the Blessed Virgin in all the Offices used on her Festivals throughout the Latin church. It is besides applied to her by many Fathers and commentators of antiquity, and among them by St. Germanus, St. Ephrem, St. Proclus, St. John of Damascene, Tarasius of Constantinople, Modestus of Jerusalem, St. Anselm, St. Ildephonsus, St. Peter Damian, and a host of others. These writers either directly apply the very words of Ecclesiasticus to Mary, or else they select different types and emblems from this chapter, and use them to express their conception of her greatness. And it is evident that the fitness of these most remarkable *accommodations* depends altogether upon the existence of a certain analogy

between wisdom itself and the prerogatives of the Mother of God. But Pusey confesses that the Holy Virgin is one who approaches as near as a created being can possibly approach to the Scriptural portrait of Wisdom given above. Hence we are bound to admit that in the judgment of the Church and of her ancient writers accommodating these portions of Scripture to Mary, there is no creature, whether angel or man, whom she does not wholly surpass in dignity, in grace, in innocency, and in glory. For she it is who is the Queen of Sion and Jerusalem, that is of the Church militant and the Church triumphant. She it is in whose sacred tabernacle her Creator designated to rest. She it is whom the unanimous voice of the Church commemorates as alone holy amidst the daughters of men, alone worthy that God should rest within her sacred body, the Lily among the thorns, the Olive ever verdant, and the Morning Star, shining with a brilliant light upon the world, and by the very splendor of its brilliancy manifesting itself as most immaculate and most innocent. Moreover, it is Mary into whose bosom the Divine bounty has poured all the treasures of Heaven. It is she who stands forth amid angels and men, exalted far above all, "like a cedar in Libanus, and as the cypress trees on Mount Sion." She, as the instrument of the Incarnation, is the instrument of Salvation, so that through her and in her all things are renewed, life repaired, the power of death destroyed, the graces of Heaven conveyed to man, Heaven itself opened, and man united with Christ his God and Saviour. She was united with Jesus in nature, because she was consubstantial with Him, and in innocency of life because she was ever pleasing to God. In all this Pusey would agree; for it is the great lesson in regard to Mary, which the Christian Fathers, Doctors, and Saints are ever urging in their hymns, panegyrics, and discourses. It is the idea of the Blessed Mother of Jesus brought out and cast into shape by such teaching as this, which they attempted to illustrate by the *accommodation* of this wonderful chapter of Ecclesiasticus. And it is impossible to ignore the judgment of the church and of her Doctors, that there really does exist a true analogy between the wisdom of God and his lovely

mother, an analogy which cannot be supposed for a moment unless Mary be acknowledged to be the most pure, the most holy, the most beautiful, and the most perfect among the creatures of God.

Who, I ask, can see in this any attempt to bridge over that impassable distance which separates the measure of Mary's glory from that of Jesus? Any attempt to hide out of sight that unparalleled eminence of the God-Man, which it is her life in Heaven to adore, to love and to praise? Surely only one of a sect that "preserves her balance . . . and observes four feasts yearly in honor of the Holy Mother," *but in not one of which is her blessed name even so much as mentioned!* Is spiritual stupidity and imbecility so withering as to dry up and scorch all the natural instincts of the human heart in presence of all that is pure, and good, and lovely, and tender, and holy?

I have now considered in a way, I trust, satisfactory to all candid readers, all those *general propositions*, so to speak, against which, on the score of *language* alone, the Vicar has most severely though only parasitically inveighed. In my next I will face severally every one of those *individual passages* textually quoted by him from "Liguori's Glories of Mary," the "Raccolta" and Pusey. I invite the earnest attention of Protestant religious teachers to my explanations.

LETTER XXIII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—To thoughtful minds and honest hearts it will appear a truism to say, that there must be an enormous difference between any comprehension of the Catholic Church and her life which can be obtained by outsiders, and the results of experience on those who have lived in church membership. This difference has been aptly compared, by the great Cardinal Wiseman, to looking at a beautiful stained-glass window *from*

without and *from within* the building it adorns. This striking illustration is especially to the point in the matter now in hand. My opponent has never experienced, or come near to experiencing, the state of mind engendered by a constant and loving devotion to the Blessed Mother of Jesus; and yet he confidently, with characteristic impudence and insolence, pits his *a priori* augury of what that state of mind must be, against the unanimous testimony of those who *know* that phenomenon on which he descants in ignorance, at once debasing and soul-dishonoring. When, for instance, he and others like him tell a Catholic, on purely *a priori* grounds, that his daily, yea hourly, *Aves* to Mary lessen his simple trust in Jesus, such a statement can only elicit from him amazement and pity; because the Catholic *knows*, as a matter most strictly within his own immediate experience, that devotion to her is in no respect inconsistent with the most jealously exclusive devotion of heart to God and to Christ; but, on the contrary, that the love of the Mother is among his most efficacious helps for growing in the knowledge and the love of the Son, that it indefinitely intensifies that love, and gives to it an otherwise untasted quality of tenderness and passionate affection. All the Vicar's absurd and groundless objections and difficulties are solved by the difference of being *without* and *within*. The wild and absolutely imaginary picture he draws of us vanishes into thin air, together with the sophisms which he so perversely constructs, or rather borrows from Pusey's *first* volume.

I ask your readers to bear in mind that Pusey admits the Catholic doctrine on the Intercession and Invocation of the Saints. For, he says: (The Blessed Virgin,) "with all the inhabitants of heaven, and she more eminently than all, does pray for us. The intercession of the saints, departed and at rest, for *us*, who are still militant, is part of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, and would be a necessary consequence of God-given love, even if it did not appear from Holy Scripture. The contrary is inconceivable." He also heartily accepts the teaching of the illustrious Bishop Milner on the permissibility of invoking Mary in particular, because he says

“that she is far more exalted and acceptable to God.” Here is the fullest admission, by my opponent’s own witness of all the Catholic principles required by your readers in this connection. Their application will appear as I proceed.

In treating of the subject in hand, in the *first* volume of the *Eirenicon*, Pusey has chosen among Catholic writers those who are most enthusiastic about the Blessed Virgin, and from these writers he picks out the strongest passages he can find. Having thus collected his materials he then so combines them that his readers will be led to think they have before them a complete representation, as if in a panorama, of what Catholics think and say about the Mother of God. The result is a caricature. No one can honestly believe that a number of expressions selected after this fashion separated from the context, and skilfully dovetailed together, will fairly represent the general tone and character of Catholic sentiment and Catholic devotion. Nay, more, this is not a fair representation of the sentiment and devotion even of those writers from whom the passages are quoted. Surely the sense of a writer upon any subject, and more particularly on a subject in which his affections are deeply engaged, is not to be judged by a few phrases, often highly rhetorical, often highly figurative, picked out from the context, and served up cold and dry for the reader. On this matter Father Newman remarks to Pusey: “I think you have not always made your quotations with that consideration and kindness which is your rule.” He thus calmly complains of the unfairness—of which Pusey is habitually guilty in his *first* volume—of taking a strong and apparently objectionable passage from an author who, either in the immediate context or elsewhere, has qualified it by other statements, which any one but a partisan writer would feel bound to take into consideration and place by its side, without giving the reader any intimation that such qualifications exist. He asks Pusey very pointedly whether he thinks “this a fair and becoming method of reasoning . . . or the procedure of a theologian”? The Vicar is beyond the reach of such an appeal. He simply out-Herod’s Ingersoll in coarse malignity and dishonesty. The greatest author he quotes from

is St. Liguori in the "Glories of Mary." Speaking of this book Father Newman says: "It never surprises me to read anything extraordinary in the devotions of a saint. Such men are on a level very different from our own, and we cannot understand them. I hold this to be an important canon in the Lives of the Saints, according to the words of the Apostle, 'The spiritual man judges all things, and he himself is judged of no one.' But we may refrain from judging, without proceeding to imitate." The Vicar, however, armed with his "yard stick," is ready to pronounce judgment even on "the spiritual man," and the less he knows of the subject the more peremptory he becomes. No words, for instance, seem sufficiently strong to express his estimate of the "Glories of Mary"—that inexhaustible mine of the most tender and beautiful sentiments in regard to the Mother of Jesus. He says that the "whole book . . . raises not a dispute as to what sort of worship (Latreia, donleia, hyperdonleia, &c.) ought to be rendered to the Virgin, but the all-important question, 'What must I do to be saved?' The practical answer to Romanists from Liguori and his followers is 'Go to Mary and you will be saved.' From our Blessed Lord and Master it is 'come unto me.'" What unclean spirit could suggest a more audacious libel than this both on St. Liguori and on the Church of God? Now, though St. Liguori's book is written for Catholics who cannot misunderstand him, yet he lays down their principles in the clearest way as if he had in his mind the Vicar and his "ilk." Thus, in his address "To the Reader" of the "Glories of Mary" he says: "In order that my present work may not be condemned by the over-critical, I think it well to explain certain propositions that will be found in it, and which may seem hazardous, or perhaps obscure. I have noticed some, and should others attract your attention, charitable reader, *I beg that you will understand them according to the rules of sound theology and the doctrine of the Holy Roman Catholic Church* of which I declare myself a most obedient son. . . . And now to say all in a few words: God, to glorify the mother of the Redeemer, has so determined and disposed that of her great charity she should *intercede* in behalf of all those for

whom His Divine Son paid and offered the superabundant price of *His precious Blood in which alone is our salvation, life, and resurrection. On this doctrine, and on all that is in accordance with it, I ground my propositions*—propositions which the saints have not feared to assert in their tender colloquies with Mary and fervent discourses in her honor.”

Pusey accepts *every word* of the “doctrine” here laid down by St. Liguori. The saint then refers his “reader” to chapters the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth of his book for the application of his “doctrine.” From one of these chapters (the eighth), the Vicar has taken what he calls the “bald concentration of the teaching of the whole book,” and then, in the very face of the author’s statement, just quoted, utters the base, satanic libel already mentioned. And he desires to pose as a “true Catholic” and a “priest”! Then again, the simplicity is almost affecting with which St. Liguori elsewhere expresses himself on figurative and rhetorical language in devotion to Mary. “Without doubt,” he says, “hyperbole, under which naine tropes (figures) are included, cannot be taxed with untruth *when it is evident from the context that it goes beyond the truth*—as is the case when St. Peter Damian says that “Mary does not pray, but commands.” The same applies to St. Anselm, when he says that “She weeps in Heaven for those who offend God.” In such cases as these, in which there can be no mistake, tropes (figures) are lawful. But such is not the case in propositions in which the hyperbole is not evident, and there would be a real deception.” The “Glories of Mary” is full of devout contemplations and pious amplifications and figurative expressions. What canon for the interpretation of these could be more clear, and simpler, than that supplied by the author? What more could St. Liguori do than he has done in these extracts to guard against such perverse and malicious misrepresentations as I am now considering? I leave it to candid Protestants to answer.

One more preliminary reflection. The same line of thought which vindicates against Unitarians and Deists the worship of Jesus, vindicates no less triumphantly against Anglicans and Ritualists the Catholic veneration of Mary. Let us suppose

the Vicar in controversey with a religiously-minded Unitarian, who labors under a blind and ignorant prejudice against the doctrine of the Incarnation, similar to that which possesses the Vicar against our doctrine and practice. The Unitarian (I have often heard him) would express his objections to the Incarnation in some such terms as these :

“Men were created for one end—the knowledge and love of God. They better fulfill that end, therefore,—they are more perfect of their kind,—in proportion as they more constantly keep the thought of God before them ; contemplate His excellences ; labor to fulfill His commands. Now this sad doctrine of the Incarnation presents one constant impediment in the way of man’s great work. When we Unitarians are oppressed with trial, temptation, suffering, we stimulate our confidence in the Almighty Creator by steadily fixing our thoughts on His Infinite Mercy and His Infinite Power. But you Trinitarians, I have often observed, shrink from this ; it is not once in a thousand times that your pious affections take any such turn. No ; you fix your thoughts not on the Infinite Love which is entertained for you by God ; but on the finite love which (as you think) is entertained for you by that created soul, which you believe God to have assumed, in the form of Christ ; and you ponder accordingly on the various most touching circumstances of Christ’s Life and Passion. Yet even if I were to grant your full doctrine, it would still remain true that the love felt for you by the soul which so suffered is but a finite love. And further, since no one finite object is nearer than any other to the Infinite, it is true, in the strictest and most literal sense, that the love felt for you by the Divine Nature as far exceeds the love felt for you by the soul of Christ, as it exceeds the love you feel for each other.

“Then, again, we Unitarians preserve untouched that most sacred truth, which your own Scriptures so prominently testify—that God alone can read the heart ; whereas you Trinitarians admit the soul of Christ into a participation of that incommunicable privilege, and thereby invest a finite object with the very attributes of Infinity. Or, again, suppose I would rouse myself to repentance for sin : I reflect on God’s Infinite Sanc-

tity—on the disloyal insult which I have offered to that Sanctity, and on the foul contrast between God, the great Exemplar, and myself. Now I will not say that you Trinitarians never do this; but I will confidently say that you far oftener do something else. You dwell on the anguish which you consider your sin to have inflicted on the loving Heart of your Redeemer; or on the contrast between your sin and Christ's spotless sanctity on earth, that is, the spotless sanctity of a created soul; or on your ingratitude for the torments endured by that soul on your behalf; and then you gaze with compunction on the pierced hands and feet. In fact, you carry this idolatrous principle into every detail of the interior life. You do not come face to face with God; what you call the Sacred Humanity (of Christ) stands up as a constant barrier between Him and your soul. Indeed, I must say that your Trinitarian doctrine of the Atonement has fearfully encouraged sin, by representing pardon for the most frightful offences as so certain and so easily obtained.

"I do not here speak," the Unitarian may continue to say, in closer parody of Pusey's assault on our devotion, "I do not here speak of saintly men, but of the great mass as we find them; of those who fulfill their religious duties in a quiet and ordinary way. These men give a certain fixed portion of each day to prayer; and it is arithmetically evident that if some of that portion goes to the created soul of Christ, so much less will be left for the Infinite God. But this is far from the worst. It is quite indefinitely easier and more pleasant to man as he is, that he shall contemplate a created object—especially one invested with the singularly pathetic and imaginative interest surrounding Christ's Life and Passion—than that he shall contemplate the Divine Nature. If men are told, therefore, that Christ's human soul knows their thoughts and can grant their petitions, they will be ever increasing the time devoted to that soul, at the expense of the time devoted directly to the uncreated. They will thus learn practically more and more to look to the created soul of Christ for pardon, for help, for strength, for consolation; it is their prayers to that soul which will issue freely and warmly from the heart; while

their direct addresses to the Divine Nature will be little more than the perfunctory and external performances of a certain stated and prescribed routine.

"Now can you justly argue," the Unitarian continues, "in reply to all this, that you regard the soul of Christ as appertaining to a Divine Person, and that your prayers to that soul are addressed to God the Son. I do not deny that such is your *theory*; the simple *fact* is this: For once that your pious affections are directed to the Eternal Father, they are directed a thousand times to the Sacred Humanity (of Christ). You Trinitarians must perforce, therefore, admit one of two alternatives, and I care not which. Either you love the Second Person of your Trinity far better than you love the First; or else you love the created soul far better than you love the Divine Person. In either case your doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation have introduced a shocking and most perverse corruption into your practical worship."

Under the pressure of such arguments from his Unitarian opponent, I think that the Vicar would be disposed to wring his hands in perplexity—at least I hope so. Great would be his distress to find that men can argue with such perverse ingenuity, on grounds purely *a priori*, in favor of a proposition proved to be monstrously and extravagantly false by the daily experience of every Trinitarian. In fact, he would have a practical perception of the effect which is produced on the mind of Catholics by his own confused "re-hash" of Pusey's criticism of our devotion to the Mother of Jesus. I mean to say that Pusey's argument against us, in his first volume, unmangled by the Vicar, is paralleled in every essential particular by the above Unitarian argument against the Incarnation and Divinity of Christ. I do not wish to be so discourteous to the Vicar as to wound his vanity and love of notoriety, by losing sight of him altogether; but he will excuse me if I prefer original sources, because he appreciates a taste for "verification." Let me then tell your readers that the pith and marrow of Pusey's argument, as spread out in the *first* volume of the *Eirenicon*, may be thus expressed: "Love of God and of Jesus is the highest of spiritual perfections. But the constant

thought of Mary by practical and devout Catholics is greatly prejudicial to this love, by drawing men's minds from the Creator to the creature; and a proof of this is, that when a pious Catholic is in trouble, he far more spontaneously turns to Mary than to her Divine Son and his Redeemer." Now the Unitarian argument against belief in the Incarnation is strikingly analogous as your readers will admit. Here it is again in summary: "Love of God, for the sake of His Divine Excellencies, is the highest of spiritual perfections. But the constant thought of Christ by practical and devout Trinitarians is greatly prejudicial to this perfection, as leading men to love God, not for the sake of His necessary *Divine* Excellencies, but for the sake of those *human* excellencies which (according to Trinitarian doctrine) He has freely assumed. And a proof of this is, that a pious Trinitarian, when in trouble, very far more spontaneously turns to the Second Person than to the First. The *Divine* Excellencies appertain to *Both*; if, therefore, it were for *them* that he loved God, the Father would be quite as frequently in his thoughts as the Son." If I had the space I could easily draw out the overwhelming Trinitarian answer to this, but it is not necessary. Undoubtedly every devout believer in the Divinity of Christ *sees* and *knows* that the Unitarian argument is monstrously fallacious; and in like manner, every devout Catholic *sees* and *knows* that Pusey's argument is monstrously fallacious—but, it goes without saying, and your logical readers must concede, that the one is just as plausible as the other.

I come at last to the Vicar's textual quotations, made as well in his very first letter, from St. Liguori and the *Raccolta*, as in his last through Pusey from other sources. I will consider them, *every one*. Nay, more; I will give him what he likes so much—"a wider view" and "useful information;" for I propose so far as my limits will allow to consider and explain for honest Protestants *all* those passages in Pusey, from whatever source, which I think present the greatest difficulty to a Protestant mind. Perhaps the "bitter regrets," which the Vicar prophesied for me, may, like the proverbial chickens, "come home to roost."

1. I will consider first the statement (*Eirenicon*, p. 105) that Mary "Appeases her Son's wrath"—whence Pusey infers that, according to Catholic writers, "the saints are more ready to intercede with Jesus than Jesus with the Father"; or (in other words) that Mary loves sinners more warmly than Jesus loves them. This objection occupies the Vicar in the sixth last paragraph of his closing "Stricture." Now here, as in so many other instances, the parallel of the Incarnation is precisely in point. The Vicar has heard many Anglican preachers say that "the Father is justly irritated," and that "the Son appeases His wrath." Does he, therefore, ascribe to them the portentous heresy, that sinners are loved with less intensity by the Divine Nature than by the soul, or Sacred Humanity of Christ? The Incarnation displays no less truly the Father's loving kindness than the Son's. "God *so loved the world* that He gave His only begotten Son." "God *commends His Love*, in that Christ died for us"; and any different doctrine belongs only to a Calvinistic heretic. And yet it is said with a most true *drift*, in practical and devotional writing, that the Son appeases the Father's wrath, and the like; because such phrases are understood to signify what is most true—viz., that in consequence of the Incarnation, the Father forgives us our sins, and treats us with immeasurably greater mercy than would otherwise have been the case. It is most certain, indeed, that the love felt for men by the Father is infinitely greater than that felt for them by the soul of Christ; and in like manner that the love felt for them by the soul of Christ is very far greater even than that felt for them by their Heavenly Mother. Still it is axiomatically evident that, if Mary's intercession has any efficacy at all (which Pusey himself asserts), it must induce her Divine Son to treat men more mercifully than would otherwise have been the case; and therefore, just as it is very suitably said that the Son appeases the Father's wrath, so it is said with precisely equal propriety that Mary appeases her Son's.

Under this head comes the famous "Vision of the two ladders," from the "Glories of Mary," over which my unhappy opponent flaps his leaden wings. Your readers can turn to it.

Let us suppose some Anglican poet to depict "a vision touching the two ladders that reached from earth to heaven: the one red, upon which the Eternal Father leaned, from which many fell backward and could not ascend; the other white, upon which the Sacred Humanity leaned, the help whereof, such as used, were by Jesus received with a cheerful countenance, and so with facility ascended into heaven." The only unfavorable comment on this I would expect from the Vicar would be that, in saying "*many* fell backward" from the former ladder, the poet implied the existence of some who did *not* fall backward from it. Otherwise he would heartily applaud such a poem as teaching the all-important truth, that Jesus is the one appointed Way of coming to the Father, and that those who attempt to reach the Father without that mediation will be disappointed. Such, then, is exactly the meaning of St Liguori, and of those saintly writers who have appealed to this vision. They teach that, to a Catholic, the Mother of Jesus is immeasurably the surest way of reaching Jesus; that those Catholics who neglect her regular and habitual invocation will find it much more difficult to obtain their sanctification and ultimate salvation. Why? Because of the might of her intercessory power, so graphically illustrated by this figure of the two ladders. For, as Cardinal Newman puts it: "If 'God heareth not sinners, but if a man be a worshipper of Him and do His will, him He heareth'; 'if the continual prayer of a just man availeth much; if faithful Abraham was required to pray for Abimelech, for he was a prophet'; if patient Job was to 'pray for his friends,' for he had 'spoken right to things about God'; if meek Moses, by lifting up his hands, turned the battle in favor of Israel, against Amalek; why should we wonder at hearing that Mary, the only spotless child of Adam's seed, has a transcendent influence with the God of grace? And if the Gentiles at Jerusalem sought Philip, because he was an apostle, when they desired access to Jesus, and Philip spoke to Andrew, as still more closely in our Lord's confidence, and then both came to Him, is it strange that the mother should have power with the Son distinct in kind from that of the purest angel and the most triumphant saint? If we

have faith to admit the Incarnation itself, we must admit it in its fullness; why, then, should we start at the gracious appointments which arise out of it, or are necessary to it, or are included in it? If the Creator comes on earth in the form of a servant and a creature, why may not His mother on the other hand rise to be the Queen of Heaven, and be clothed with the sun, and have the moon beneath her feet?"

But there is no need of *argument* here at all. It is Pusey's own contention that the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, more eminently than that of all the saints, for us who are still militant, is part of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, and a necessary consequence of God-given love. (*Eirenicon*, vol. 2, p. 33.) That is to say: God has so determined and disposed that she should intercede in behalf of all those for whom Christ paid and offered the superabundant price of His Precious Blood in which alone "is our salvation, life, and resurrection." Her intercession is a part of the Divine plan, a merciful chain by which God has bound the hearts of His prodigal children in all ages to Himself. Pusey and St. Liguori, one of the greatest luminaries of the Catholic Church, are at one. "May the infinite goodness of our Lord be ever praised," says Bishop Kingdon's "devout soul," St. Bernard, "for having been pleased to give us Mary as our advocate in heaven, that she, being at the same time the Mother of our Judge and a Mother of Mercy, may be able, *by her intercession*, to conduct to a prosperous issue the great affair of our eternal salvation." And St. Augustine says: "As Mary co-operated by her charity in the spiritual birth of the faithful, so also God wills that she should co-operate by her intercession in obtaining for them the life of grace in this world and the life of glory in eternity." These quotations are from St. Liguori, and this is the doctrine stamped on every page of the "Glories of Mary." But intercession and invocation are correlative doctrines in Catholic teaching which Pusey accepted absolutely, and I have already triumphantly proved its truth quite independently of his admissions. Now, St. Liguori declares in his *Introduction* that the great object of his book is to portray Mary's intercessory power with her Divine Son and to

urge Catholics to have recourse to it. The vision of the two ladders is one among very many of the beautifully striking and figurative illustrations used by him to impress this truth upon the minds of his readers. "Come unto Me" is the consoling invitation of our dear Lord. And surely we do not go less directly to our Redeemer for grace and salvation by going in company with His Blessed Mother, since all prayer to her (let it never be forgotten) is always most truly, though indirectly, virtually and ultimately the worship of Him from whom alone it can have any efficacy, while her intercession secures this worship offered in the most effective way. I need not dwell longer on this blazing truth. The subtlest minds have confessed its incomparable beauty, as the purest hearts have done homage to its irresistible attraction. To say nothing of countless saints, in all the long ages of the past, nor of myriads of pure and bright souls known only to God, Mary has counted in modern times among her noblest children and most loving clients such mighty intellects and luminous thinkers as Suarez, Bellarmine, Schlegel, Bossuet, Fenelon, Lacordaire, Monsabré, Ward, Harper, Faber, Manning, Newman, Brownson, Marshall, and Leo XIII.

The Vicar concludes his stricture on the "story" of the two ladders as follows :

"Liguori says in the story Jesus has no compassion for struggling sinners; He will not lend them a helping hand to Paradise; they fall again and again if they respond to His invitation, 'Come unto Me,' but they succeed on the first attempt up Mary's ladder, because she has such compassion for poor sinners she will bestir herself to help them. There is something far worse than grotesqueness here—something far worse than even heresy. It is apostasy."

Were I to characterize this infamy in the words of our Divine Lord or of St. John the Baptist, the Vicar would complain that I was no "gentleman" and protest against the use of the "Shillalah"; but, in the face of my explanation of the "story," to say nothing of its own very words, is not his statement an outrage against reason and God? It contains as many falsehoods as lines. There is no contrast, intended by the

saintly writer, between Jesus and Mary as regards their power and willingness to help souls struggling to be free. The whole point in the figure is to enforce the efficacy of the Mother's intercession with the Son on behalf of those whom He has redeemed. Who but the Vicar would dare impute to so great a saint and Doctor of the Church as St. Liguori the intolerable error that the love felt for us by Mary exceeds that felt for us by the Soul of Christ?

LETTER XXIV.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—I continue my explanations of the language characterized as "impious" by the "gentleman" from Oxford.

2. "God retaineth justice to Himself, and granted mercy to (Mary)" (*Eirenicon*, p. 105). "God has resigned into her hands (*if one may say so*) His Omnipotence in the sphere of grace" (p. 103). "To her He has committed the kingdom of mercy, reserving to Himself that of justice." The last of these quotations is, perhaps, the commonest shape in which the idea is expressed; but that idea is one and the same. Now such phrases as these convey a meaning, either on the one hand intolerable and heretical, or on the other hand beautiful and edifying, according to the sense in which they are taken. They may *in themselves* mean that our Divine Lord has in such sense given to Mary the kingdom of mercy, as *to have abdicated that kingdom Himself*—that mercy and grace can no longer be obtained by addressing Him directly, but only by invoking His mother. Such a notion, no Catholic need be told, would be nothing less than an appalling blasphemy. I will only say, therefore, that no one but the progeny of "utterly unredeemed villains" ever dreamed of so understanding the statement. Catholics know that the holy men who most constantly uttered it were also foremost in urging those prayers to the Blessed Sacrament and the Sacred Heart of Jesus which are absolutely inconsistent

with its false interpretation; and that they are even more ardent and glowing than other Catholic writers in their description of those unspeakable blessings which flow from prayer to the Sacred Humanity of Christ. Indeed, throughout the writings of the great St. Liguori there is manifested a veritable ocean of love and confidence in our Lord, absolutely overwhelming the few sentences strongly setting forth his severity to sinners. Open, for instance, his "Reflections on the Passion of our Lord." In chapter xiv. he says: "Jesus Christ did not cease with His death to intercede for us before the Eternal Father. He still at present is our advocate; and it seems as if in heaven (as St. Paul writes) He knew no other office than that of moving His Father to show us mercy—'always living to make intercession for us' (Heb. vii.). And, adds the Apostle, the Saviour for this end has ascended into Heaven 'that He may appear in the presence of God for us'" (Heb. ix.). This is but an imperfect sample.

There remains, then, the true sense of the statement I am considering. Christ has reserved wholly to Himself the kingdom of justice; He has given to His mother no lot or part whatever in the office of judging and condemning. But Catholics love to say that He has so handed over to her His kingdom of mercy, that she possesses (as it is often expressed) an "*intercessory omnipotence*"; that the invocation of her will be fully as effective in obtaining mercy and grace from Christ, as would be prayer to Him offered with the same dispositions. To all, therefore, who feel themselves bowed down by a sense of sin, she is a truly attractive object of veneration and supplication, because her office in heaven as an *intercessor* is exclusively that of mercy, and *within* that sphere her Divine Son has communicated to her the greatest power. Father Newman says: "Our Lord cannot pray for us, *as a creature*, as Mary prays; He cannot inspire those feelings which a creature in spires. To her belongs, as being a creature, a natural claim on our sympathy and familiarity, in that she is nothing else than our fellow. She is our pride,—in the poet's words, 'Our tainted nature's solitary boast.' We look to her without any fear, any remorse, any consciousness that she is able to read us, judge us, punish us."

3. "To sinners who have lost Divine grace, there is no more sun" (the symbol of Jesus) "for him, but the moon is still on the horizon; let him address himself to Mary" (p. 106). "No sinner doth deserve that Christ should any more make intercession for him with the Father . . . and therefore it was necessary that Christ should constitute His well-beloved Mother a mediatrix between us and Him" (p. 105). "(Mary) is the only refuge of those who have incurred the Divine indignation." "Often we shall be heard more quickly, and be thus preserved, if we have recourse to Mary and call upon her name, than we should be if we called on the name of Jesus our Saviour." "Many things are asked from God and are not granted; they are asked from Mary and are obtained."

The last two are the Vicar's quotations from St. Liguori in his first letter. Now, did he find such words as the above without any indication of authorship, the Vicar, with his fragmentary idea of Christianity and peculiar *views* on the Incarnation, might be forgiven if he understood them to mean, that one who has fallen into mortal sin commits grievous presumption in offering direct prayer to God; and that God would have no power to remit mortal sin if He had not created Mary to intercede for it. But notoriously every Catholic in the world would regard either of these propositions with horror unspeakable—and since the words were addressed by a Catholic to Catholics, it is clear that neither writer nor readers understand any such blasphemy. In fact, as I have often explained, St. Liguori and others were able to use such strong language, precisely *because* no one of their readers could by possibility take their words in their literal sense. It is as though a son said to his mother: "You are the author of my being—in you is my only hope," and the Vicar immediately pounced on him for blasphemously and impiously introducing a second Deity.

Let me submit a Catholic interpretation of the language I am considering. It is as if the saintly authors had said to us: "If you have once possessed the unspeakable blessedness of justification and adoption, and have fallen from that blessedness by deliberately outraging your Creator with mortal sin, you have nothing favorable to expect from God's *Justice*.

With no approach to injustice, God might remove you straightway from earth to hell; there is nothing bought for you by Christ in His Sacred Passion which could preclude your Creator from so acting. You must sue, then, for favors which Christ has *not* secured for you by His Passion—you must throw yourself most unreservedly on His Mercy, and you have more hope of forgiveness in proportion as you more keenly realize this fact. Yet this very keenness of realization may injure you, unless you adopt the appointed remedy. Your sense of the insult you have offered to God may make you feel as though there were ‘no sun in the horizon’—may make you slow in apprehending the boundless mercy of Him who is to be your judge. He has Himself provided for this your obvious need. He has appointed a mediatrix, who entertains for you no feeling but that of pity, and whose maternal love will strengthen and encourage you to approach her Son. Nor is this all; for her prayers have a most powerful effect in obtaining for you a far greater degree of mercy than He would otherwise have granted.”

4. ‘ ,ing He obeyed not only His Father, but also His Mother (158). “The Blessed Virgin is superior to God, and God Himself is subject to her in respect of the manhood which He assumed from her.” “However she be subject unto God, inasmuch as she is a creature, yet she is said to be superior and placed over Him, inasmuch as she is His Mother.” “You have over God the authority of a mother, and hence you obtain pardon for the most obdurate sinners.” “At the command of the Virgin all things obey, even God.”—Vicar’s quotation in first letter.

My opponent, in his ignorance, is often so severe on Catholics for going beyond Scripture, that one might have expected some forbearance when they have but used New Testament language. St. Luke says (c. ii. v. 51): “He came to Nazareth, and was subject to them.” Who was “He”? The Incarnate God. Who were “they”? Mary and Joseph. Now, Pusey, in his *first* volume, p. 103, expresses himself as though the very phrase “God is subject to Mary” were so plainly revolting as to require no express refutation: *yet it is almost word*

for word the Holy Ghost's statement through St. Luke! Moreover, to say that the Incarnate God was subject to Mary and Joseph is simply and precisely saying in other words that they were "superiors" "set over" the Incarnate God. We have it, then, on the infallible authority of the Holy Ghost, that for certain years the Incarnate God was subject to His Mother; that she was "superior" to Him—"set over" Him—"had over Him the authority of a mother."

There are probably many "educated English gentlemen, holding the Orders of the Church of England," who, on reading this argument, would at once object, that our Lord was only placed under Mary and Joseph during His nonage, before His faculties were fully developed. The Vicar has given no evidence that his belief is otherwise. But Pusey held, of course, as strongly as Catholics do, that from the very moment of His miraculous Conception the soul of Christ knew distinctly and explicitly every object which it knows even at this present moment. Other Protestants again are more or less consciously under the impression, that since our Lord's Ascension His Sacred Humanity has in some sense ceased to be; but here again Pusey would heartily anathematize any such heresy.

Let me begin, then, by examining what the Holy Ghost meant in St. Luke's words. This, of course, is certain; that at every moment there was this or that particular act, which the Eternal Father wished the soul of Christ to elicit; and also that this precise act, did, in fact, always take place. We cannot suppose, however, consistently with St. Luke's language (to put it on no other ground), that the commands of Mary and Joseph were constantly overruled by the superior claim of God's will; and still less can we suppose that that Will surrendered its claim to *them*. Only one supposition then remains, which is unquestionably the true one. God so inspired Mary and Joseph that whenever they commanded Jesus, such command was precisely accordant with the Divine preference; and Jesus, among the various motives which at that moment influenced His *human will*, vouchsafed and deigned to direct His act to this particular motive also, viz., the virtuousness of obeying

His Mother; and of obeying him, too, whom God had appointed to stand in the place of an earthly father.

Now, firstly I ask, what possible difficulty there can be in supposing that the same obedience was paid by Jesus to Mary's authority at a somewhat later period, viz., when He entered on His Passion? That He prepared Himself for this by asking her permission? That "by dying He obeyed not only His Father but also His mother"? I am not arguing that He did so, though, for myself, I have every disposition to believe that He did so. But I ask, what possible *theological objection* can be raised against such an opinion, should it commend itself to some holy and "devout soul"? Canon Oakeley (The Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work, pp. 24-25) points out the plain implication of Scripture, that at the Annunciation "She must express her free and unbiased consent before the human race can be redeemed in the manner fore-ordained of God": and he then proceeds:

"Nor can I see (though I admit this to be rather the pious inference of devotion, than the logical conclusion of dogma) that any more direct share in the unapproachable office of our Redeemer is ascribed to His Blessed Mother *in regarding the Passion itself as suspended upon her consent*, than is implied in the intimacy thus proved by the language of Scripture itself to have existed from the first between the decrees of the most Holy Trinity and the free-will of the Blessed Virgin."

Now, then, following Jesus and Mary from earth to heaven, something still surely remains in their mutual relations, not identical indeed (far from it), yet surely not unanalogous. Take the parallel of an absolute monarch, whose mother still lives and is fondly loved by him. He possesses over her undoubted supreme authority, and so far from her being able in any true sense to command him, he can impose his commands on her without appeal. And yet his assent to her just petitions will not altogether resemble in kind his assent to other suppliants,—he will regard her still with a real filial deference, and she will in a figurative sense, exercise over him a certain maternal authority. This, then, is the simple and obvious sense of the expressions last above quoted. Such burn-

ing words represent, indeed, rather the shape into which men of ascetic lives and profoundly spiritual minds are accustomed to cast their thoughts, than the standard of ordinary preaching or the scale of general devotion. Yet it seems most touching and appropriate, and most conducive to a real apprehension of the Divine Personality of Christ and a more intense love of the Incarnate God, that earnest devotees of Mary should delight in setting forth, exhibiting, amplifying, her various unapproached and singular prerogatives among God's Saints. She herself declares them in the *Magnificat*: "For He that is mighty hath done great things to me and holy is His name."

I may add here, as in the former case, that the paradoxical form itself which such expressions wear, shows clearly how far it was from the mind of their originators that they should be construed literally. In every case a Catholic in a Catholic country was addressing Catholics, who could never dream of suspecting him to mean what both he and they knew to be erroneous and heretical. No one more abounds in such expressions than St. Liguori, and no one takes greater pains than he to guard against perversions of his meaning, as I pointed out in my last letter. He gives his testimony to the general orthodoxy around him in the words already cited: "Figures are permitted whenever *there cannot be any mistake* on the subject." Of course there were no Ritualistic Vicars abroad in these days.

5. "It seems to be a part of this system to parallel the Blessed Virgin throughout with her Divine Son, so that every prerogative which belonged to Him by nature or office, should be in some measure imputed to her" (p. 161). The Vicar adopts this, and copies from Pusey in support of it, a confused "heap" of incoherent ejaculations.

Can there be a more perverse and stupid comment than this? If you earnestly love two objects, it is a delight to trace every possible analogy and similarity between them; between their circumstances, their character, their benefits to you; and the fact therefore, to which Pusey draws attention (the Vicar cannot see beyond the mere letter of Pusey's page), shows how dearly the lovers of Mary love her Son. But who, except Anglicans and parasites of the crude and unenlightened views

of Pusey's *first* volume, would dream of drawing the very opposite conclusion of inferring that Catholics elevate the Mother into her Son's rival and antagonist?

LETTER XXV.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I resume my explanations of the language on which the "educated English gentleman" from Oxford "holding the Orders of the Church of England" bases his charges of "Infidelity," "Apostasy" and "Idolatry" against the Catholic Church—the Bride of Christ.

6. St. Liguori says: "Those whom the justice of God saves not, the infinite mercy of Mary saves by her intercession."

Pusey puts the word "infinite" in italics, as showing the point of his objection; but can it be seriously claimed that St. Liguori lays down a dogmatic proposition, the infinitude of Mary's attributes? "I have taken *infinite* trouble to oblige you," says a friend to the Vicar. "Sir," gravely replies the latter, "you shock me; no one can do anything infinite save God alone." St. Liguori meant, of course, that the Mother's mercy and love for her Son's redeemed embraces every kind of evil, moral or spiritual, which can possibly be brought before her in prayer.

7. St. Liguori also says (p. 103): "God has resigned into her hands (*if one might say so*) His Omnipotence in the Sphere of grace." The very words which I have italicized show that he is not speaking literally; and the general thought has been already explained under No. 2.

8. "Mary is our only refuge, help, and Asylum." "Health of the Weak, Refuge of Sinners, Comforter of the Afflicted, Help of Christians."

These are titles given, as I have already shown, by the Fathers and saintly writers throughout the ages, to the Blessed

Virgin. Her Litany of Loretto (so called) is a necklace of such tenderly beautiful pearls; and I have before me at this moment the name of each contributor to the collection, from the "Holy Mother of God" of the Council of Ephesus to "Queen of the Holy Rosary," solemnly added by the beloved and illustrious Leo XIII. How it must sadden the heart of a "true Catholic" Ritualist to see so great a Pope—and in the nineteenth century too!—thus abet and promote "Infidelity," "Apostasy" and "Idolatry"! In his third "Stricture" the Vicar told us that: "On the accession of Leo XIII. wiser councils prevailed" "with regard to the worship of Mary." How chilling to his "true Catholic" aspirations!

But let me give your readers the context of these titles from St. Liguori himself. They can then form some idea of the honesty and fairness of the Vicar and his patron saint—Little-dale. St. Liguori writes:

The Angelical Doctor, St. Thomas, says, that we can place our hope in a person in two ways: as a principal cause, and as a mediate one. Those who hope for a favor from a king, hope it from him as lord, they hope for it from his minister or favorite as an intercessor. If the favor is granted it comes primarily from the king, but it comes through the instrumentality of the favorite; and in this case he who seeks the favor is right in calling his *intercessor* his hope, &c. The King of Heaven, being infinite goodness, desires in the highest degree to enrich us with His graces; but because confidence is requisite on our part, and in order to increase it in us, He has given us His own mother to become our mother and advocate—(our most powerful intercessor, as Pusey admits)—and to her He has given all power to help us; and, therefore, He wills that we should repose our hope of salvation and of every blessing in her. Those who place their hopes in creatures alone, independently of God, as sinners do, and in order to obtain the favor and friendship of man, fear not to outrage his divine Majesty, are most certainly cursed by God, as the prophet Jeremias says. But those who hope in Mary, as Mother of God, who is able to obtain graces and eternal life for them, are truly blessed and acceptable to the heart of God, who desires to see that greatest of His creatures honored, for she loved and honored Him in this world more than all men and angels put together. And therefore we justly and reasonably call the Blessed Virgin our hope, trusting, as Cardinal Bellarmine says, "That we shall obtain *by her intercession*, that which we should

not obtain by our own unaided prayers." "We pray to her," says the learned Suarez, "in order that the dignity of the intercessor may supply for our own unworthiness; so that (he continues) to implore the Blessed Virgin in such a spirit, is not diffidence in the mercy of God, but fear of our own unworthiness."

Perhaps, after all, it is only "the poor Irish" who can appreciate this, since there are only "two beings, certainly such, *in rerum natura*" whom the "lawless" Ritualistic preacher does not fear—Almighty God and his own Bishop, whom, as ex-deacon Froude tells us, he regards only as "some high-bred, worn-out animal, useless in himself, but infinitely valuable for some mysterious purpose of spiritual propagation."

I have thus far considered not only all the quotations from St. Liguori made by the Vicar, but a selection of the most difficult from Pusey as well. I now proceed to those extracts which the Vicar prophesied would be "new and perhaps shocking to many of the Romanists of this diocese." They are taken from a work of the venerable Grignon de Montfort, translated into English by the saintly Father Faber, who speaks of the book in these terms:

"There is a growing feeling of something inspired and supernatural about it as we go on studying it; and with that we cannot help experiencing after repeated readings of it that its novelty never appears to wear off, nor its fullness to be diminished, nor the fragrance and sensible fire of its unction ever to abate."

This is pretty good testimony from very high authority. But before considering in order those various propositions of Montfort which I am specially to treat, I will give one or two other extracts as illustrating the relative position which he respectively ascribes to our Divine Lord and His blessed mother. He says:

"I avow, with all the Church, that Mary, being but a mere creature that has come from the hands of the Most High is, in comparison with His Infinite Majesty, less than an atom; or rather she is nothing at all, because He only is 'He Who is,' and thus by consequence that grand Lord, always independent and sufficient for Himself, never had, and has not now, any absolute need of the holy

virgin for the accomplishment of His will and for the manifestation of His glory. . . .

"Jesus Christ our Saviour, true God and true Man, ought to be the last end of all our devotions, *else they are false and delusive*. Jesus Christ is the *Alpha and Omega*, the beginning and the end of all things. We labor not, as the Apostle says, except to render every man *perfect in Jesus Christ*; because it is in Him alone that the whole plenitude of the Divinity dwells, together with all the other plenitude of graces, virtues, and perfections; because it is in Him alone that we have been blessed with all spiritual benediction; and because He is our only Master, who has to teach us; our only Lord, on whom we ought to depend; our only Head, to whom we must belong; our only Model, to whom we should conform ourselves; *our only Physician, who can heal us; our only Shepherd, who can feed us; our only Way, who can lead us; our only Truth, who can make us grow; our only Life, who can animate us; and our only All in all things, who can suffice us*. There has been no other name given under heaven, except the name of Jesus, *by which we can be saved*. God has laid no other foundation of our salvation, of our perfection, and of our glory, except Jesus Christ. *Every building which is not built upon that firm rock is founded upon the moving sand, and sooner or later will fall infallibly*. Every one of the faithful who is not united to Him, as a branch to the stock of the vine, shall fall, shall wither, and shall be fit only to cast into the fire. If we are in Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ in us, we have no condemnation to fear. Neither the angels of heaven, nor the men of earth nor the devils of hell, nor any other creatures, can injure us; because they cannot separate us from the love of God which is in Jesus Christ. By Jesus Christ, with Jesus Christ, in Jesus Christ, we can do all things; we can render all honor and glory to the Father in the unity of the Holy Ghost; we can become perfect ourselves, and be to our neighbors a good odor of eternal life.

"If, then, we establish the solid devotion to our Blessed Lady, it is only to establish more perfectly the devotion to Jesus Christ, and to put forward an easy and secure means for finding Jesus Christ. *If devotion to our Lady removed us from Jesus Christ we should have to reject it as an illusion of the Devil*, but on the contrary, so far from this being the case, there is nothing which makes devotion to our Lady more necessary for us, as I have already shown, and will show still farther hereafter, than that *it is the means of finding Jesus Christ perfectly, of loving Him tenderly, and of serving Him faithfully*" (pp. 37-39).

Is there any "Infidelity," "Apostasy," or "Idolatry" about this? Let me ask your fair readers a simple question: Are any words quite adequate to express the feelings of detestation and sickening disgust that must force themselves on the mind in presence of the tactics of this Vicar? Remember—he has never read, nay more, never seen, Montfort's book. This is the most charitable view, while, I am sure, it is simple fact. And yet, while simulating an honesty to which he is an utter stranger, and pretending an anxiety for "verification," he snatches up *second-hand* a lot of scraps, and swoops down upon the Catholic Church and attempts to defile by his Harpy touch the purest and holiest thoughts. But he calls himself a "true Catholic" and a "Priest"! May God forgive so sacrilegious use of two so venerable words!

Your readers will bear in mind that the Vicar copies his extracts from Pusey's *first* volume of the *Eirenicon*. He introduces those which I am about to explain with these words: "De Montfort *does not scruple* to assign to the Blessed Virgin an office like that of God the Holy Ghost, in dwelling in the soul." Compare this with Pusey's statement as follows: "(De Montfort) *seem(s)* to assign to her an office like that of God the Holy Ghost, in dwelling in the soul." In the words I have italicized your readers can see the difference between the rabid, ignorant fanatic and the man who fears to misrepresent. Pusey says: "It *seems* to me that De Montfort meant so and so," implying a doubt of his understanding him aright; the Vicar, with no more aptitude for entering into the spiritual beauties of a writer like Montfort than a Chimpanzee, changes Pusey's modest doubt into an absolute affirmation that Montfort "does not scruple" to say so and so. Commend me to a ritualist "Priest" for honesty and a tender regard for truth! I need not say that the idea in any shape, ascribed to Montfort, is ridiculous in the extreme. And now for the quotations.

9. "De Montfort speaks of souls which are not born of blood, nor of flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God and Mary." Let me give your readers the context of these words. Montfort, speaking of his book, says:

“Oh! but my labor will have been well expended if this little writing, falling into the hands of a soul of good dispositions, a soul well born,—born of God and of Mary, and not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man,—should unfold to him, and should by the grace of the Holy Ghost inspire him with the excellence and the price of that true and solid devotion to our Blessed Lady, which I am going presently to describe. . . . I feel myself more than ever animated to believe and to hope all which I have had deeply engraven upon my heart, and have asked of God these many years, namely, that sooner or later the Blessed Virgin shall have more children of love than ever; *and that by this means, Jesus Christ, my dear Master, shall reign more in hearts than ever.*”

In the face of such burning words as these, where is the difficulty in the expression under consideration? Is not a cold spirit of criticism most revolting? An examination of the following extracts will make this very clear.

10. “The Holy Ghost chose to make use of our Blessed Lady to bring His fruitfulness into action by producing in her and by her Jesus Christ in His members.” “When Mary has struck her roots in the soul, she there produces these marvels of grace which she alone can produce, because she alone is the fruitful Virgin, who never has had, and never will have, her equal in purity and fruitfulness.” “She alone can produce in union with the Holy Ghost singular and extraordinary things. When the Holy Ghost, her spouse, has found Mary in a soul, He flies there; He communicates Himself to that soul abundantly and to the full extent to which she makes room for her spouse.”

Now, these expressions, in their obvious Catholic sense, are simply beautiful and singularly suggestive. They are based upon the *analogy* between that joint office, on the one hand, whereby, in the Incarnation, the Holy Ghost and Mary produced Christ Himself, and that joint office, on the other hand, whereby they form Christ in the individual soul. The thought which they express is simply a development of the doctrine of our Lady’s Maternity, and is evidently taken from St. Augustine. Nay, the very passage is quoted by Montfort in which that Father says, that according to the Spirit, Mary is clearly our Mother, both because we are His members who took flesh

in her womb, and because by her love she co-operated in the birth of the faithful in the Church, of whom He is the head. That the Vicar may gratify his taste for "verification" and consult his "friends in England," I give the original from St. Augustine as follows: "Spiritu quidem . . . plane Mater est membrorum ejus, quod nos sumus; quia co-operata est charitate ut fideles in Ecclesia nascerentur, quae illius capitis membra sunt: corpore vero ipsius capitis Mater" (*De Sancta Virginitate, Lib. i. 6*). The same thought is expressed by Origen, when he says: "Jesus says to His Mother, 'Behold thy son!' and not 'Behold he too is thy son!' as if He had said: Behold here is Jesus whom thou hast begotten. For whoever is perfect, no longer lives himself, but Christ lives in him. And as in him Christ lives, so it is said to Mary: Behold thy Son, Christ" (*Origen in Joann, i. 6*). And St. Bonaventure says: "Mary has two sons, the Man-God and pure man, and of both she is the mother, of the one corporally, of the other spiritually." Again, too, Blessed Albert the Great teaches that Mary is the "Mother of all who are reborn to life, and she is the Mother of us all according to all the properties of maternity, because He was begotten of her in whom all are regenerated." And so also the great Abbot Guerric most beautifully writes: "She is the only Virgin mother who glories in having brought forth the only Begotten of the Father, who embraces her only Begotten in all His members, and who is not confounded at being called the Mother of all those in whom she recognizes that her own Christ has been formed, or is in the course of formation;" and again: "If the servant of Christ (St. Paul, Galatians iv. 19) is in labor again and again of his little children . . . until Christ be formed in them, how much more the Mother of Christ? For she herself desires to form her only Begotten in all the children of adoption . . . and she is in labor of them all daily . . . until they meet into the perfect man, into the measure of the fullness of the age of her Son." See Abbot Guerric's *Sermons on the Assumption*.

It is this beautiful thought, then, which runs through both Montfort's Treatises on our Blessed Lady, and hardly an ex-

pression occurs in either of them which may not be found in other approved authors. As Christ became Incarnate, and was born of God the Holy Ghost and of Mary, so also He is formed by both in the souls of the regenerate. It is a first principle of Christian theology that the Holy Ghost differs from the other Divine Persons, in that He has no *Divine* Fecundity. The Father generates the Son; the Father and Son, by one undivided spiration, produce the Holy Ghost; but He produces no Divine Person. It is only, therefore, in acting on created things that His Fecundity exists. And now your readers will be able to understand the extract given above: "The Holy Ghost brings into fruitfulness His action by (Mary) producing in her and by her Jesus Christ in His members." An expansion of this thought explains the other extracts under this head: Thus: Certain pure souls permit Mary to "strike her roots" in them; that is, to produce in them, by her watchful vigilance and unremitting intercession for them before the Throne of Grace, a real though imperfect image of herself, by the imitation and practice of those virtues which made her so pleasing to God. Will the Vicar deny that the virtues of Faith, Humility, and Purity, as illustrated in Mary's life are dear to the Holy Spirit? Does he agree with Pusey that God endowed her with a "superhuman, engraced beauty of soul . . . alone in His whole creation?" Then why does he stumble? By a very familiar figure of speech, Mary is said to "strike her roots" (words of Ecclesiasticus, ch. 24) in pure hearts, because her name is a synonym for all the glories of divine grace that can embellish a human soul, and of which she herself was so conspicuous an example. When the Holy Ghost sees that Mary *has* thus taken root, or (to use Montfort's expression) when He sees Mary in those souls, He flies to them and performs the "startling wonder" of forming Christ within them. "She and the Holy Ghost produce in the soul extraordinary things; and, when the Holy Ghost finds Mary in a soul He flies there." In other words, sanctity in its germs is attributed by Montfort to Mary's intercession on behalf of souls desirous of imitating her virtues. In its maturity, however, it is described as the formation of Jesus Christ in the

soul, through the joint agency of the Holy Ghost and Mary. She watchfully intercedes; He, in answer to her prayer, puts forth His highest efficacy in training and nurturing the soul, and so the complete image of her Son is more and more effectually produced within it.

But what wonder is there in all this? If the Holy Ghost overshadowed Mary with love unspeakable in her little house at Nazareth on that midnight of the New Creation, what wonder that the heavenly Dove should also fly and find a resting-place in those elect souls in which Mary "*has taken root*," and with which the Catholic Church has ever been resplendent? For what, after all, is the great work of the sanctification of the souls of men, but the Incarnation of Christ in each of them, by which they are made "flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone?" Now, if St. Paul could say to the Galatians: "My little children, of whom I am in labor again, until Christ be formed in you;" and if he could say to the Corinthians that he had "begotten them in Gospel," and to Philemon that he had "begotten Onesimus in his bonds," why should a conceited, spiritually mole-eyed Vicar, who never read a page of his book, cast stones at so holy a servant of God as Montfort, for saying that Christ is formed in our souls by Mary, who is His Mother and our Mother; and that she watches over His growth in us, and our growth in Him, until we grow "unto the perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ," as lovingly and tenderly as she watched over Him, as He "advanced in wisdom and age and grace before God and men"? Will the intelligence of this community stand it, that "educated English gentlemen" so called,—graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, if you will,—dare undertake to instruct the public by ignorant criticisms on books they have never read, of whose doctrines they are profoundly ignorant, and by insulting assaults upon a creed whose articles they but ape and mimic in their attempts to eke out the merest theological existence?

11. "According to that word, 'The Kingdom of God is within you,'—in like manner the kingdom of our Blessed Lady is principally in the interior of a man, that is to say, his soul." Thus the Vicar after Pusey. He takes a scrap right out of

the middle of a sentence. Here is the extract in full from Montfort :

“Mary is the Queen of heaven and earth, *by grace*, as Jesus is the King of them *by nature and by conquest*. Now, as the Kingdom of Jesus Christ consists principally in the *heart* and *interior* of a man—according to that word, ‘The Kingdom of God is within you,’—in like manner the Kingdom of our Blessed Lady is principally in the interior of a man, that is to say, his soul; and it is principally in souls that she is more glorified with her son than in all visible creatures, and that we can call her, as the Saints do, the Queen of hearts.”

These beautiful sentiments have already been fully elucidated, but I give them for the purpose of considering the *one* quotation made from the *Raccolta* by the Vicar in his first letter. This would appear to be so strong as to set all his “true Catholic” zeal ablaze. In the Vicar’s quotation occur these words, *apropos* of Mary’s birth: “We pray thee with all fervent love, be thou born again in spirit in our souls, through thy most holy love, rekindle in our hearts the fire of thy love, and bid all virtues blossom there which may cause us to find more and more favor in thy gracious eyes.” The Vicar says this prayer “attributes to the Virgin an entrance into our souls!” [See his third “Stricture” in the closing paragraphs.] And he further says that “even Newman, honest though he fain would be, does attempt to ‘explain away’ this prayer, and wisely overlooks others in the *Raccolta* equally bad.” What idiotic impertinence! Now mark you. Only a few lines before, with the most barefaced suppression of the truth, as I will show, he represents Father Newman as deploring “the devotions and instructions concerning the office and worship of the Virgin being introduced from Italy into England.”

What will your readers say when I tell them, that the most beautifully extreme book on devotion to the Blessed Virgin in use among Catholics throughout the world is the *Raccolta*, and that the best translation, from the Italian, is that made by that genuine Oxford scholar, Father St. John of the Birmingham Oratory, under Father Newman’s own direction. A new edi-

tion has just been issued with the *re-imprimatur* of Leo XIII., on whose accession "wiser counsels" were to prevail, as the sapient "Priest of the Mission Chapel" informed the world. Look now at the Vicar's "muddie." Why should Father Newman attempt to "explain away" a prayer which the "Mission Chapel" critic says "attributes to the Virgin an entrance into our souls," when no such prayer exists? He admits immediately before this, that Father Newman protests against "that teaching." And so he does; nay more, he denies the existence of any such doctrine, for he says: "(Mary's) presence is above, not on earth; *her office is external, not within us*. Her work is not one of ministration toward us; her power is indirect. It is her prayers that avail, and her prayers are effectual by the *fiat* of Him who is our all in all." How, then, can Father Newman be said to attempt to "explain away" teaching which he denies has any existence at all? Of course, neither the prayer from the *Raccolta* nor Montfort teaches any such doctrine as the entrance or presence of Mary in the soul. The thought here is allied with what I have already said about Mary's Divine Maternity and the analogies based upon it. In the extract under consideration Montfort refers to two things. On the one hand to the *implicit thought* of Mary, which he considers will always be present to the mind of one who faithfully practices the devotions he recommends, and endeavors to imitate her virtues, especially her holy purity. On the other hand, and as if by way of requittal, Mary exercises (so Montfort thinks) a very special influence, and practises a very special watchfulness by her intercession, over such a faithful soul. In a word, the keynote of his doctrine is simply that of St. Paul himself in the text already quoted: "My little children, of whom I am in labor again, until Christ be formed in you" (Gal. iv. 19). If the Vicar would make this profound thought a matter for his pious contemplation, instead of his ignorant criticism, his "sermons to men only" on some of the lost virtues might bear some fruit.

It will be in order here to point out the Vicar's barefaced suppression of the truth, and to protest against his monstrous misrepresentation of Father Newman. I refer to the close of

the third "Stricture." He there represents Father Newman as saying, of expressions quoted by Pusey from Catholic writers, as follows: "Sentiments such as these I never knew till I read them in your book, nor, as I think, do the vast majority of English Catholics know them. . . . *They seem to me like a bad dream.* . . . They defy all the *loci theologici.* . . . *They do but scare and confuse me.*"

Now what is it that Father Newman really said in the paragraph of his letter in reply to Pusey's *first* volume, from which the Vicar quotes? He was commenting on certain passages quoted by Pusey from St. Liguori, from Montfort, from Salazar, and others. Your readers know that Pusey's quotations were "scraps" picked out, and separated from their context. Father Newman had never read in their context the passages cited by Pusey. He therefore said (1) that he put them away from him "when taken in their literal and absolute sense, as any Protestant would naturally take them, *and as the writers doubtless did not use them.*" He said (2) that these passages, "*as they lie in Dr. Pusey's pages,*" will be understood by *Englishmen of the nineteenth century* as containing certain propositions which he drew out. He said, however, (3) that he "*knew nothing of the originals*"; and (4) that he was not speaking unfavorably of all of these passages "*as they are found in their authors,*" because he was confident that they did not mean what Pusey thought. "I will have nothing to do with statements, which can only be explained, by being explained away. I do not, however, speak of these statements, as they are found in their authors, for I know nothing of the originals, and cannot believe that they have meant what you say; *but I take them as they lie in your pages.*" So far then was Father Newman from speaking of a "Certain set devoted to extreme views" as the Vicar scandalously misrepresents him, that he actually expressed his disbelief in the existence of any such "*Set.*" Does the Vicar believe Father Newman's own testimony as to Father Newman's own meaning, or does he not? If he does, how can he be excused from wilful suppression and misrepresentation? If he does not, what reasons can he give for his disbelief? Father Newman expressly said

that he had not examined Pusey's quotations, and "knew nothing of the originals." Is it *probable* that he would have expressed severe censure on passages taken from Catholic works, which he had not even seen in their original shape and in their context? Such is not Father Newman's habit—he leaves that to his maligners and the Littledale brood generally.

LETTER XXVI.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—I continue my examination of the Vicar's charges of "Infidelity," "Apostasy" and "Idolatry."

In my last letter I pointed out that Father Newman, in his letter to Pusey, contented himself with protesting against the meaning attached by Pusey to the extracts made by him from several writers. How easily the great Cardinal could have defended these illustrious men from the unfounded calumnies of Pusey, reiterated by the Vicar, your readers are now aware from the simple analysis of their language which I have given. Fifteen years before, however, Father Newman had written down the philosophy of the cowardly dishonesty of the Vicar's mode of controversy. Here are his words :

"Protestants judge of the apostles' doctrine by 'texts,' as they are commonly called, taken from Scripture, and nothing more; and they judge of our doctrine, too, by 'texts' taken from our writings, and nothing more; picked verses, bits torn from the context, half-sentences, are the warrant of the Protestant idea of what is Apostolic truth on the one hand, and on the other, of what is Catholic falsehood. As they have their chips and fragments of St. Paul and St. John, so have they their chips and fragments of Suarez and Bellarmine; and out of the former they make to themselves their own Christian religion, and out of the latter our anti-Christian superstition. They do not ask themselves sincerely, as a matter of fact and history, *What* did the apostles teach them? Nor do they ask

sincerely, and as a matter of fact, *What* do Catholics teach now? They judge of the apostles and they judge of us by scraps, and on these scraps they exercise their private judgment,—that is, their prejudice, . . . and their assumed principles, . . . and the process ends in their bringing forth, out of their scraps from the apostles, what they call ‘Scriptural religion,’ and out of their scraps from our theologians what they call Popery.

“Catholics, at least, have a lively illustration and evidence of the absurdity of Protestant private judgment as exercised on the Apostolic writings, in the visible fact of its absurdity as exercised on themselves. They, as their forefathers, the first Christians, are a living body; they, too, preach, dispute, catechise, converse with innumerable tongues, saying the same thing as our adversaries confess all over the earth. Well then, you would think the obvious way was, if they would know what we really teach, to come and ask us, to talk with us, to try to enter into our views and to attend to our teaching. Not at all; they do not dream of doing so; they take their ‘texts’; they have got the cut-and-dried specimens from our divines, which the Protestant tradition hands down from generation to generation, and, as by the aid of their verses from Scripture, they think they understand the Gospel better than the first Christians, so by the help of these choice extracts from our works, they think they understand our doctrine better than we do ourselves. They will not allow us to explain our own books. So sure are they of their knowledge, and so superior to us, that they have no difficulty in setting us right and in accounting for our contradicting them.

“Thus, Protestants judge us by their ‘texts’; and by ‘texts’ I do not mean only passages from our writers, but all those samples of whatever kind, historical, ecclesiastical, biographical, or political, carefully prepared, improved, and finished off by successive artists for the occasion, which they think so much more worthy of credit and reliance as to facts, than us and our word, who are in the very communion to which those texts relate. Some good personal knowledge of us, and intercourse with us, not in the way of controversy and criticism, but what

is prior—viz., in the way of sincere inquiry in order to ascertain how things really lie—such knowledge and intercourse would be worth all the conclusions, however elaborate and subtle, from rumors, false witnessings, suspicions, romantic scenes, morsels of history, morsels of theology, morsels of our miraculous legends, morsels of our devotional writers, morsels from our individual members, whether unlearned or intemperate, which are the text of the traditional Protestant view against us. . . . Yet any one is thought qualified to attack or to instruct a Catholic in matters of his religion: a country gentleman, a navy captain, a half-pay officer, with time on his hands, never having seen a Catholic or a Catholic ceremonial, or a Catholic treatise in his life, is competent by means of one or two periodicals and tracts, and a set of Protestant extracts against Popery, to teach the Pope his own religion, and to refute a council.”

In these words your readers have as perfect a picture of the Vicar’s “Strictures” as can possibly be drawn—and they will ask for no better authority than John Henry Newman. In addition, I have fully illustrated their truth.

12. To return to the Vicar’s quotations. In the “Novena for the Feast of our Lady’s Nativity,” referred to in his first Letter, occur these words: “We hail thee, dear child, and we *humbly worship* Thy most holy body, &c.” The italics are his. So throughout the “Strictures,” he emphasizes the word “*worship*” and “*idolatrous worship* of the Virgin” as applied to Catholic devotion to the holy Mother of God. In the opening paragraph of his first “Stricture” he professed to have “some experience with the tricks of controversialists.” His acts certainly do not belie his words. In the matter now under consideration he is guilty of one of the most contemptible of controversial tricks. He must know that by the word “worship,” his Protestant readers are generally led to understand *adoration*; in which sense he must also know that Catholics do not worship either the Blessed Virgin, or any other saint. A great part of the objection to the language of Catholic devotion, made by ignorant or dishonest Protestants, arises from the practice of confining certain words to their conventional

sense, instead of interpreting them according to the intention of the writer or speaker; or, on the other hand, of restricting to a secondary and technical use those which are employed in a more general sense. Thus there is really no difference, in fact, between the terms "worship" and "veneration"; yet, while mere human qualities are popularly considered to warrant veneration, Catholics are charged with idolatry who speak of the Blessed Virgin as an object of worship—a charge the more impertinent and insulting when we remember that in the words of the marriage rite, common to Catholics and Protestants, this word is actually employed in the sense of "service" or "devotion." The word "adoration," again, has come to be restricted, like that of "prayer," to the homage claimed by God only; though the first according to its etymology need mean no more than "invocation," and the second, though refused to the Saints, is used without scruple in petitions to Parliament or the Legislature. *All such words mean only what they are meant to imply. They are to be interpreted by our intention, and not our intention by them.* The word "worship," then, in its real old English acceptation, means *honor* or *respect*. And so we find it, used by Bishop Latimer, one of Littledale's "miscreants," as follows: "Take Saints for inhabitants of heaven, and *worshipping* of them for praying to them. I never denied but they might be *worshipped*, and be our mediators, though not by way of redemption (for so Christ alone is a whole mediator, both for them and for us), yet by way of intercession." Do we place magistrates and members of the Masonic body, for instance, on a level with the Almighty when we address them as "*Worshipful*"? Do we believe that a supreme and divine honor is given to the person to whom these words of the marriage service are addressed: "*With my body I thee worship?*" and do not Protestants read in their own Bible (1 Chronicles xxix. 20): "and all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and *worshipped the Lord and the King?*" This may suffice on this point for the instruction of candid Protestants who are in danger of being misled by such tricksters as the Vicar. Catholics "*worship*"

God alone, in the ordinary Protestant sense of that word, but many of our writers use it to express that honor and veneration we pay to the Mother of God and the Saints, because it is a most serviceable word, for which it is very difficult to find a substitute.

Let me add a word for the Vicar's benefit. A few years ago England was roused from one end to the other to do its utmost in honor of Shakespeare, on the occasion of the tercentenary of his birthday. A distinguished Oxford professor delivered an eloquent address, which closed with these words: "May England never be ashamed to show to the world that she can love, that she can admire, that she *can worship* the greatest of her poets." Would the Vicar denounce this as idolatry? Not at all; he reserves that epithet for those whose hearts and affections overflow in meditation upon the sublime thoughts suggested by Mary's birthday. The simple truth is that the sensual materialism of the man's thought blinds him to the beauty of things invisible and spiritual in the order of grace. He has no idea of Mary's position in the divine economy of man's redemption; and while he would applaud the orator who *worshipped* Shakespeare, he has nothing but insults and curses for us who honor *her*, "whose being," as Pusey beautifully writes, "ever lay in God's eternal councils, who must have been in His divine mind when, in all eternity, He contemplated the way in which He should unite His rational creation to Himself, redeeming our fallen race; from whom He, who should be God and Man, was to derive His human flesh, and in His sacred childhood to be subject to her."

13. "Perhaps Romanists of these parts are not aware that the heretical teaching of Cornelius à Lapide of old, concerning the body and blood of Mary being received with the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, *has been practically received by many Romanists in Europe*. . . . Newman condemns it; but there it is. Leading Romanists like Faber, Oakeley, and Cardinal Manning esteem it, at least, a worthy, pious opinion. . . . Where such teaching will lead people God only knows. It is surely Romanism run mad."

The Vicar here surpasses all his former infamies. From the

days of Cain it has ever been, that the nearer the hater of the Catholic Church approaches her altars the more intense and loathsome his hatred becomes. The nearer he comes to infinite purity, goodness, nobleness, love, the more does his base and craven nature boil and seethe in its presence. And, it is not a hatred engendered by the reason of intelligence, but it is the bitterness of human passion, of a debased and poisoned nature under the influence of a power beyond the most sublimated rankness of mere flesh and blood. History repeats itself in the "Priest of the Mission Church."

I ask your readers to follow me while I expose the iniquity and ignorance of the Vicar in his handling of Pusey's matter.

A young German ecclesiastic, named Oswald, once went the extravagant length of maintaining that the body of the Blessed Virgin is co-present with our Lord's in the Holy Eucharist. Oswald's book was promptly put on the Index, and the teaching put forth in it condemned by the church as "erroneous, dangerous, and scandalous." Oswald "laudably submitted himself" and retracted his words. The instinct of a Catholic would have anticipated this condemnation. There is not a word to be said in behalf of so shocking a notion, as that our Lady's body, or any part of it, is co-present in the Eucharist. It is simply monstrous, and the Catholic Church, the jealous and sleepless guardian of God's truth, was not slow to so declare it, though, I suppose, very few even of Catholic students ever heard of it. Yet this is the doctrine which, the Vicar infamously declares, "has been practically received by many Romanists in Europe." I know nothing that could do justice to the iniquitous recklessness of such a loathsome calumny, short of the scourge of cords so effectually applied by our Divine Lord to the desecrators of the Temple. Has he any *personal* knowledge to justify such a statement? Of course not. Does he offer a particle of evidence in support of it? Not at all. *Can* he produce any? Not a tittle. Where did he get the materials out of which he *manufactured* it? Let us see.

In the *first* volume of the *Eirenicon*, Pusey quoted Oswald's book as authority for the proposition under consideration. He

also said that he himself noticed it in a letter written to Doctor Jelf about twenty-five years before, as a "belief, *said* to exist among the poorer people of Rome"; but then, to Pusey's honor, he frankly confesses, in a note, p. 169, that for this statement he had only the authority of a friend who had been staying in Rome! This is the miserable evidence on which even Pusey bases the rubbish of which the *Eirenicon* is so full. The important points in his argument he fills up with hearsay and private reports, which can tell upon the credulous, but escape the possibility of exposure. Here, however, your readers have the "whole cloth" out of which the Vicar makes his infamous calumny, that Oswald's monstrous doctrine "has been practically received by many Romanists in Europe." Compare this assertion with its source in the *Eirenicon*, and it will be difficult to dismiss the suspicion that some unclean spirit must be riding this unfortunate man to death.

But now mark you. It was promptly pointed out to Pusey that Oswald's doctrine was reprobated and condemned by the Catholic Church. Thereupon, in the *second* volume of the *Eirenicon*, he pleaded ignorance of the condemnation, apologized and explained. Here are his words: "I am thankful to hear that (Oswald's) book has been condemned. Of course, had I known this, I should not have quoted him. But I think it hard to be blamed for not knowing this, or for not looking in the Index to ascertain the fact, when I had no ground to imagine it." About Pusey's blunder and its correction the honest, truth-loving Vicar says not a word. He is bound, however, that we shall not have the benefit of it. He suppresses all mention of Oswald, and practises one of his controversial tricks by attributing Oswald's doctrine to Cornelius à Lapide, Faber, Oakeley, and Cardinal Manning.

What a muddle! Here, however, he is not entirely to blame, since knowing nothing about the matter himself, he but limps along after Pusey, and falls into the ditch with his master. The fact is, that Pusey confused Oswald's condemned tenet with another which differs from it in every relevant particular. Various Catholic writers have held that a certain portion of matter, which *once* belonged to the Blessed Virgin, *now*

belongs, unchanged, to her Son; and is therefore present in the Eucharist. For instance, Canon Oakeley says that "all which was *once* the Blessed Virgin's is infinitely exalted in the human nature of our Lord by its union with the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and is *now no otherwise hers*, than as it was from her that our Lord condescended to take that nature." And again he says: "In the same sense, surely in which we say that the blood of our parents and ancestors flow in our veins (those physical changes notwithstanding) and *with the necessary limitation expressed above*, we may also say, and truly say, that the blood of the Blessed Virgin was in her Son from first to last, and is, therefore, in that wondrous communication of Himself which He makes to us in the Blessed Eucharist." À Lapide, as quoted by Pusey himself, says: "That flesh of Christ, *before* it was detached, *was* the own flesh of the Blessed Virgin." These words the Vicar suppresses in his quotation from Pusey; and they are absolutely necessary to the true meaning of à Lapide's words as quoted. The old trick! To this opinion Father Faber also inclines and he cites in its behalf a vision of the great St. Ignatius. Even that mighty intellect—Suarez, equal to the whole Lambeth Conference, holds the same opinion. The Vicar says "Newman condemns it." Another calumny—Newman does not even so much as allude to it. Of course he condemns Oswald's doctrine, but the radical distinction between that and the tenet professed by the writers just quoted is manifest. *Yet even this is no Catholic doctrine*, though according to Aristotelian Physics it is nature's own order. To me, however, a true Catholic metaphysic of the Incarnation supplies any defects in "*the Philosopher's*" physical science, and argues the truth and beauty of à Lapide's sentiment.

If then there are good speculative grounds for holding this tenet, the pious inferences drawn by à Lapide are certainly most apt and fitting, and heartily welcome to an orthodox if not to a "true Catholic." Now this is not the place for discussing nice questions of physiology and chemistry, but would the Vicar be good enough to inform the "Romanists of these parts" by what authority he pronounces the "pious opinion"

of Oakeley, Faber, and à Lapide to be "heretical." He can get no assistance from Pusey here. While waiting for the light, let me assure your readers that these writers are as far removed from upholding any true co-presence of Mary in the Blessed Eucharist, as Ritualists are from *having* any Real Presence.

14. "Romanism in this diocese," the Vicar thinks, is "*very Low church* indeed." And he expresses his solicitude for us in these words: "May the cultus of Mary never so develop here as to make it possible to distinguish the English and Roman churches, as they are distinguished in Southern India and Ceylon, as "Jesus churches" and "Mary churches."

Here again he only repeats Pusey. Now, I can understand Catholic churches being called "Mary churches" by some ignorant extern or Ritualist, who knows nothing about the presence of the Blessed Sacrament, and who sees a large image of our Blessed Lady surrounded by eager suppliants, engaged in prayer and meditation to their inestimable spiritual advantage; but by what possible indication he could be led to call an Anglican edifice a "Jesus church" it utterly bewilders one to conjecture. Is it in an *Anglican* edifice, then, that he would see a colossal image of Christ crucified, and a crucifix placed conspicuously over each of the numerous altars? Look at the disgraceful scene being enacted to-day in England in what is called the "Reredos case." It is simply a question whether an image of our Divine Lord on the Cross shall be tolerated on the altar or in the sanctuary. The Bishop of London refused to interfere, and now the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's have been compelled to appeal to the Attorney-General. This is perfectly proper. The Royal Arms or a bust of her gracious Majesty, the Queen, who is the head of the English Establishment, instead of the Crucifix! Of course; and the first law officer of the State is the proper person to look after the Sovereign's rights in this regard, and to help the bishop to decide the question. "Give to Cæsar what belongs to Cæsar"—and everything "belongs to Cæsar" in the English State Church. Again: At the so-called Reformation, altars were everywhere converted into communion tables. The very word

"altar" is not to be found in the authorized Book of Common Prayer, but a "convenient and decent table" is provided by the 82nd Canon. In the celebrated cases of *Liddell* versus *Westerton* and *Liddell* versus *Beal*, the Privy Council, which is above the Lambeth Conference, decided that in the Church of England there was "no longer an altar of sacrifice, but merely a table at which the communicants were to partake of the Lord's Supper; that the term *altar* is never used to describe it, and there is an express declaration at the end of the service against the doctrine of transubstantiation, with which the ideas of an altar and sacrifice are closely connected." In a word, take out of the "Mission Church," so called, what is there contrary to "lawful authority" in the Church of England, and one might as well give the appellation "Jesus Church" to a Mohammedan Mosque so far as visible emblems are concerned.

LETTER XXVII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—I conclude to-day my demolition of the Vicar—his charges of "Impiety," "Infidelity," "Apostasy" and "Idolatry"; and also my humble vindication of the position, theological and devotional, assigned by the Catholic Church to the ever-blessed Mother of Jesus in the Christian scheme.

15. "In my copy of the Breviary," says the Vicar, "is a small picture of the Virgin crowned with thorns."

What a revolting profanation is the *sneer* at the Sorrowful Mother expressed in these words! I may not dare make any commentary on it. I beg permission, however, from your outraged readers, to offer a few reflections.

To expiate the crimes of Saul and his people, and arrest the famine which they had brought upon the nation, it was decreed that seven of his children should be crucified. They

were accordingly crucified "upon a hill before the Lord." Two of the victims were the sons of Respha. Let us see the mother's place at such a scene of agony and ignominy: "And Respha, the daughter of Aja, took haircloth and spread it under her upon the rock from the beginning of the harvest till water dropped upon them out of heaven; and suffered neither the birds to tear them by day nor the beasts by night. And it was told to David what Respha had done" (2 Kings xxi. 10). How inexpressibly touching is this picture of maternal affection—that patient, calm, resigned breast, which endures unsubdued shame, grief, fatigue, not to speak of the quivering agony of a mother's heart, witnessing torment in the best-beloved—all from that very love. Apprehending *by the standard of nature*, the communion of eye and heart, if not of word, which took place between Respha on her rocky seat and Armoni on his cross, would the Vicar blaspheme against any artistic portrayal of the mother's sorrow? Then change the scene to Calvary, and recall the closing scene of Mary's Son, crucified on a hill before the Lord for expiation of others sins. "There stood by the cross of Jesus, His mother." Let that great, human-hearted preacher, Dr. Talmage, describe this picture:

"O woman, in your hour of anguish, whom do you want with you? Mother. Young man, in your hour of trouble whom do you want to console you? Mother. If the mother of Jesus could have only taken those bleeding feet into her lap! If she might have taken the dying head on her bosom! If she might have said to him: 'It will soon be over, Jesus, it will soon be over, and we will meet again, and it will be all well.' But no; she dared not come up so close. They would have struck her back with hammers. They would have kicked her down the hill. There can be no alleviation at all. Jesus must suffer, and Mary must look. I suppose she thought of the birth-hour in Bethlehem. I suppose she thought of that time when, with her boy in her bosom she hastened on in the darkness in her flight toward Egypt. I suppose she thought of his boyhood, when he was the joy of her heart. I suppose she thought of the thousand kindnesses He had done her, not forsaking her nor forgetting her even in His last moments; but turning to John and saying: 'There is mother; take her with you. She is old now. She cannot help herself. Do for her just as I would have

done for her if I had lived. Be very tender and gentle with her. Behold thy Mother.' She thought it all over, and there is no memory like a mother's memory, and there is no woe like a mother's woe."

Would Dr. Talmage, though no "true Catholic," object to a crown of thorns as fitly symbolizing the sorrows and trials of the mother of such a Son? Certainly not. Our Divine Lord was *par excellence* the "Man of Sorrows," and bore His Crown of Thorns; but surely His blessed Mother, in her own unapproachable degree, was *the* "Mother of Sorrows" and had *her* Crown of Thorns. Would the Vicar be advised to spend some time during next "Lent" in meditation on the "Stabat Mater"? He might then "get up" another "Sermon" with less disgusting hypocrisy in it than his first contained.

16. "It is, of course, an abuse of (Catholic) teaching," admits Pusey, "when any *confine* their prayers to the Blessed Virgin." But he adds,—“A certain proportion, *it has been ascertained* by those who have inquired, do stop short in her.” I do not like to place on permanent and public record my views of such pitiable and ridiculous rubbish. Is that "certain proportion" never then to make the theological acts of faith, hope, and charity? Never to prepare for Confession—that searching of reins and heart, face to face with God alone? Never to receive Holy Communion, and pour out in thanksgiving such feelings of exuberant exaltation as can accompany no prayer to the Blessed Mother? Does this "certain proportion" carefully avoid all visits to the Blessed Sacrament, to the Forty Hours' Exposition, to the solemnity of Benediction? "It has been ascertained," forsooth! by whom, when, where, *how*? I apologize heartily to the humblest intelligence among my fellow-Catholics for thus noticing this revolting ignorance. Even Pusey's learning does not save him from frequent manifestations of that idiocy, with which the Vicar has made us so familiar.

17. I now come to the Vicar's complaint, copied *verbatim* from Pusey, against Father Faber, for saying that "an immense increase of devotion to Mary," "*nothing less than an immense one,*" is among the most desirable of eventualities.

Before commenting on this, let me put before your readers the sentiments of the Anglo-ritualist periodical, the *Union Review*. This was the organ of the Unionist Party in the Anglican church in 1866, led by Pusey and others, of which I have already spoken. The *Review* says:

“Jesus chose Mary. What more can be said? When it is said, not concealed in learned language, but conveyed in warm and loving words throughout the length and breadth of England, we shall be satisfied. The people *are being taught* to believe in Jesus: *they must learn to link her name with His in their memories*, as it is in the Sacred Scriptures and as it is in the Divine Decrees. *In every heart in which the Cross is set up She*, the Mother of the Crucified, *must find a place*, and her own place. Then, and not till then will a reproach be rolled away from England, then and not till then may we hope for reunion with the rest of Christendom.”

O what a rapture! Is it not simply *transporting* to hear your opponent talk in such strains, though in the next breath he vilifies the saintly Faber, for expressing similar thoughts, though happily in a very different spirit—“Faber, whose memory I cherish,” says Pusey, “and from whom I thankfully own that I have learned much.”

But to return to my text—Faber’s desire for “an immense increase of devotion to Mary.” These words occur in Father Faber’s preface to De Montfort’s work, already referred to; and they do but say what that profoundly spiritual writer earnestly inculcates. Now, to a Catholic nothing can be more intelligible and acceptable than Montfort’s and Faber’s view. Would to God that Protestants would take it to heart in these days when the world, outside the Catholic Church, has ceased to believe in the Incarnation, and Naturalism and Agnosticism flaunt their banners to every breeze! The Incarnation casts off two rays of light: on the one side, the mystery of the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar; on the other, the devotion due to the blessed mother of Jesus. The shepherds of Bethlehem from the hill-sides, the Magi from the East, came to adore the newly-born God. “They found the Child with Mary His mother”; they found Him resting in His mother’s arms, as on His appointed throne. They anticipated that very form of

worship which Catholics have retained and Protestants rejected. It was, indeed, one of Mary's greatnesses and benedictions, that her Divine Son thought fit to manifest Himself in an age and condition which obliged Him to manifest her with Him. Thus, it is a right belief about the Divine Maternity of Mary which is the most perfect safeguard and security of the doctrine of the Incarnation. The whole of the Christian religion depends upon this doctrine, and the one true and only sovereign remedy against the decomposition of this fundamental truth is to be found in the dogma of the Divine Maternity—"Mary, of whom was born Jesus." Father Newman says :

"If we look through Europe, we shall find, on the whole, that just those nations and countries have lost their faith in the Divinity of Christ who have given up devotion to His Mother, and that those on the other hand, who had been foremost in her honor, have retained their orthodoxy. Contrast, for instance, the Calvinists with the Greeks, or France with the North of Germany, or the Protestant and Catholic communions in Ireland. . . . In the Catholic Church Mary has shown herself, not the rival, but the minister, of her Son; she has protected Him, as in His infancy, so in the whole history of the Religion."

The *Union Review* concurs, in these words :

"It is also true, and deserves consideration, that there has been hitherto no marked tendency to heresy on the subject of the Incarnation among Roman Catholics, while, where the dignity of the Blessed Virgin has been underrated heresies have speedily crept in."

The reason is obvious. The Church teaches in a thousand ways that the most effective and acceptable way of contemplating Jesus, is the uniting with His mother in that contemplation; that the thoughts of Jesus and of Mary should be indissolubly united. By honoring Mary as His Mother one can never forget that He is Man; by approaching Him through her mediation one can never forget that He is God. "Mary is the *marvellous echo of God*," beautifully writes Montfort, "who answers only 'God' when we say 'Mary'; who glorifies only God, when with St. Elizabeth we call her Blessed." So,

too, devotion to her, if worthy of the name, will assuredly issue in a loving contemplation of her history—of those mysteries (as Catholics call them), Joyful, Sorrowful, Glorious, which are commemorated in the Rosary. Now, there is no history of her current in the Church except in closest connection with her Divine Son. On the details of her life during those periods when her life was led apart from His—before the Annunciation and after the Ascension—Scripture preserves a deep silence; nor has there been any beyond the most sparing supplement of Scripture from the stores of tradition. Her joys, as contemplated by Catholics, were in His Presence; her sorrows in His Passion; her exaltation in His Resurrection and Ascension. To dwell on her mysteries, then, is to think of Him in the most affecting and impressive way in which that thought can possibly be presented.

Thanks be to God, we see to-day the fulfilment of the aspirations of Faber and Montfort. Most remarkable has been the increase of devotion to the blessed Mother of God during the last quarter of a century, and its fruit is an increase of the worship of her Son. But it is in the wants of our own times that we find the special reason for this devotion. During the month of October, our illustrious Pontiff, Leo XIII., has directed the recital of the Rosary in every church throughout the world, and in his Encyclical Letters urges us to recite the Rosary without ceasing and *to never interrupt that holy exercise*. In this city, too, there has just been established "The Association of the Perpetual Rosary," in which it is recited *day and night uninterruptedly*, to render homage to our Blessed Mother, and to commemorate the Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is these scenes in the Divine Drama that the Rosary recalls and puts before us each time we repeat it. It is simply "an abridgment or compendium of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." It compels us, so to speak, to fix our minds on the various details of the history summed up in the words of the Evangelist: "*And the word was made flesh.*" It invites us to become familiar with the working out of the Divine plan for man's salvation. It is an easy and appropriate, yet

the sublimest, series of Bible lessons. How far more real and vivid the impression made by such a pious exercise as this than by that merely verbal study of the New Testament which prevails outside the Church! Contrast the intelligent knowledge of Our Lord's Life and Death and Resurrection possessed by a Catholic child who has been taught the Rosary, with that of a mere Protestant Bible reader, and there will be no doubt which of the two best appreciates the meaning and the value of the Gospel story. And so, Bishops, Cardinals, and Popes, rulers of men and leaders of thought, statesmen, politicians, generals, and kings tell their beads, and find in the Devotion of the Rosary a holy and wholesome practice of prayer, well suited to raise the thoughts to God and do honor to His Divine Majesty. The predictions of Montfort and Faber have been justified. "Ignorance," says Carlyle, "is an awkward, lumpish wench, not yet gone into vicious courses, nor to be harshly used; but ignorance and insolence—these are for certain an unlovely mother and bastard." That the "mother" and the "bastard" are of the Vicar's kith and kin is once more apparent.

I have now met unquailingly, and answered fully and defiantly, not only *every one* of the "scraps" gathered by the Vicar from Pusey, St. Liguori, and the *Raccolta*, but, at the cost of some tediousness, I made a selection from Pusey of others which I conscientiously believed to be the greatest stumbling-block to candid Protestants, in the apprehension of our doctrine on the topic in dispute. The labor has been to me one of love and simple delight, and I will feel amply rewarded if your honest Protestant readers will have learned, that the religion which most of their teachers and writers inveigh against under the name of the Catholic religion, is a religion which Catholics themselves would detest most cordially—*if such a religion really existed!*

I have something more to say about Pusey, whose testimony has been so damning to the Vicar. Your readers are aware of the difference between the tone of the *first* and *second* volumes of the *Eirenicon*. But I am able to offer them a piece of independent evidence from Pusey, which will serve, for all time,

to destroy the value of the *first* volume as an arsenal for ritualistic Vicars in their quixotic attempts to hide their theological nakedness. I have three Letters written by Pusey after the appearance of the *Eirenicon*. Two of them are addressed to the editor of the London *Weekly Register*, a Catholic paper, and the third to Dr. Wordsworth. This last contains an express avowal of that lamentable ignorance as to the very meaning of the Immaculate Conception with which Father Newman had charged him. But I am not concerned with this now. I refer to the first, that of Nov. 22, 1865, in which he expressly and deliberately retracts the violent and ignorant criticisms of his *first* volume, which the Vicar now "trots out" afresh—suppressing all notice even of the *second* volume. Your readers will remember that at this time Pusey with the Unionist Party was seeking admission into the Catholic Church—*on terms!* Here are his words:

"Let me say that I did not write as a reformer, but on the defensive. *It is not for us to prescribe to Italians or Spaniards what they shall hold, or how they shall express their pious opinions.* All which we wish is to have it made certain by authority that we shall not, in case of reunion, be obliged to hold to them ourselves. *Least of all did I think of imputing to any of the writers whom I quoted that they took from our Lord any of the love which they gave to His mother.* I was intent only on describing the system. . . . *I had not the least thought of criticising holy men who held it.*"

These are certainly extraordinary words from the author of the *Eirenicon*, as the Vicar has introduced it to your readers; out, nevertheless, they are the sober, second thoughts of the Vicar's witness to his "wider view of the cultus of Mary," on which he bases his loathsome charges of "Impiety," "Infidelity," "Apostasy," and "Idolatry"!

Now mark. The very devotions which Pusey denounced in the *Eirenicon* are now mildly characterized as the "expression" of men's "pious opinions." Why, then, may not those who use the English tongue, as well as Italians and Spaniards, if God draws them to it, "express their pious opinions" in a similar shape? Again. In St. Liguori, in Montfort (whom Pusey constantly quotes), and in a thousand other like-minded

men—next to their personal love of God and of their Saviour—there was no more conspicuous characteristic of their whole interior life than their enthusiastic devotion to Mary. Pusey, in his work, describes this devotion as extravagant, and as tending to obscure the thought of God; but now he protests in his letter that he had “no thought of criticising these holy men.” What does the Vicar say? How does Pusey support his charges?

Pusey thinks, moreover, that none of these men took from our Lord any of that love which they gave to His mother. But if so, their love of Mary must have been to them an unspeakable blessing. Surely to love tenderly, and contemplate unremittingly, a spotlessly holy creature, will be admitted by every religious man to be in itself an immense blessing. Ignorant Protestants, however, commonly think that this blessing cannot be obtained without paying for it too high a price; without taking from our Lord a large portion of that love which they give to His mother. Why is it, by the way, that Protestant preachers and “heated pulpiteers” generally, so persistently disparage tenderness to the highest and purest creature that ever came from the hands of God, while so tolerant of creature-love in a very far more questionable shape? How transcendently transcendental becomes the spirituality of some “uxorious men of God” as they descant on the “idolatrous worship” paid by Catholics to the lovely Virgin Mother! Really, to hear their language about us, one would suppose that they exhaust the whole tenderness of their hearts on Objects simply Divine; that there is among them no love of mother, of wife, of children, of friends—that their hearts beat with sensible love for God and for God alone. Out on such damning hypocrisy! Now Pusey, at all events, thinks the Protestant objection chimerical; and he must consider, therefore, that the love of Mary is an unmixed blessing to “these holy men.” In other words, Pusey thinks that they derive an inappreciable happiness and blessing from a devotion which his poor parasite denounces as “Infidelity,” “Apostasy,” and “Idolatry”! So much for Pusey considered as a witness invoked by the Vicar, and for his *evidence* against us.

I now proceed shortly to remark on Pusey's *competency* as a witness to the teaching of the Catholic Church, as evidenced by the *Eirenicon*. The Vicar in his sixth letter thus speaks of it: "Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, 3 vols., is a perfect storehouse of accurate information on Roman errors, and is specially full on the cultus of the Virgin. Every lover of Christian truth should secure a copy." With the *third* volume we are not concerned in this discussion. The *first* and *second* alone engage us. The Vicar, for reasons already pointed out to your readers, suppressed all reference to Pusey's sentiments expressed in the *second*, and took his "wider view" from the *first*. This has reached the *seventh thousand* edition, and is the armory from which such controversial tricksters as the Vicar borrow their weapons. Bishop Kingdon got his little story from the same source.

Pusey had been brought into active and successful controversy with the school of rationalists and unbelievers in the Anglican Church; he had attacked "Colenso's heathenism," as he calls the doctrine of a bishop of his own church, and he had grappled ably with the infamies written in "Essays and Reviews" by beneficed ministers of Anglicanism. It was the unhappiness of Pusey's position, however, that he was compelled to join issue with Rationalism *in detail* rather than *on principle*; that he was precluded from assailing it at its starting point—that he could not impugn its first principles without condemning the whole ecclesiastical position of the Anglican Church. It is more apparent now than when uttered by Disraeli forty years ago, that for men who must think on such matters, the issue is between the Catholic Church and infidelity. Protestantism in all its protean shapes, as an intellectual system of Christianity, is "played out." The one secret of intellectual strength is intellectual consistency. Catholics, and they only, are able consistently to contend against the foe, because they only have consistently contended against the foe's fundamental maxims. Pusey had a measure of success because he worked on Catholic lines and used Catholic principles. For his noble services to that portion of Catholic truth, which he held in common with them, Catholic writers have expressed the warmest gratitude.

Now, it has been observed by the learned and philosophic De Maistre as noteworthy, that so many writers, who have warred against infidelity with signal power and success, when turning their weapons against Rome, have been suddenly smitten both with feebleness of arm and unskilfulness of aim. No more singular instance of this can be found than the *first* volume of the *Eirenicon*. Pusey was occupied twelve months on its composition, and it is a *mass* of inaccuracies and gross mistakes. Error and misquotation is the rule, accuracy the rare exception, while his elaborate notes are one vast congeries of blunders. He has heaped together from Protestant sources long-exploded accusations against the Catholic Church, and objections, refuted long ago, against her teaching; and he has filled more than half his volume with the effete sophisms of the Protestant controversialists of the last three centuries, of which modern criticism has learned to be ashamed. But he has not been content with this. He has filled up the nooks and corners with gossip and hearsay, and the interesting communications of his private correspondents; or, with calumnies, which are only at large because they preserve their *incognito*. I have counted and marked *twelve* such argumentative indecencies. He has undertaken to explain our Councils and Papal Bulls for us, according to principles of interpretation which we can neither accept nor admit; and in the course of his disquisitions has displayed so complete an unacquaintance with the scholastic Theology from which he professes to quote as to elicit feelings of simple pity. He has in fact confounded articles of faith with questions still open to discussion; has misunderstood the authors whom he quotes, and made them defend as opinions of their own, what they, in common with the whole church, have condemned as heresy. So far does this ignorance go, that he has actually quoted, in the instance of three distinct Doctors, arguments which, according to the known practice of the great scholastic Theologians, are placed at the commencement of the articles or chapters for the express purpose of refutation, as though they were the genuine opinions of the authors themselves. Your readers have already as much proof of these statements as they, at present, can require.

And this is the book that "educated English gentlemen" quote against the benighted "Romanists of these parts"! Were I an Anglican, my daily prayer would be that God might frustrate the consummation of Imperial Federation, lest more of such "*gentlemen*" might be inflicted on the church in this Province.

Let us see now, if a new witness will contribute something to comfort the Vicar. Ah! there is *Saint* Littledale! and his "admirable and honest Plain Reasons, 30th Thousand!" Now, I intended to devote a Letter to this ritualistic "Pope," and the "Plain Reasons, &c.," but time does not permit; nor is it necessary, since I can refer your interested readers to Father Ryder's "Catholic Controversy," a reply in detail to the "Pope's" book. As a good Catholic, however, always respects a Pope, I cannot entirely ignore him, though my remarks will be only supplementary to Father Ryder's book.

I begin, then, by asserting that "Richard Frederick Littledale, LL.D., D.C.L.," is an infamous liar and unmitigated hypocrite, for *every* hypocrite is a liar. Now I will prove it.

In his "Plain Reasons" Littledale denounces the doctrine and practice of the Invocation of Saints and Angels, and devotes pages to prove the Catholic Church "idolatrous" on this account. Now he is either a hypocrite or an idolater with her. For, I have before me a ritualistic book entitled: "Devotions for the Communion of Saints," which not only advocates veneration and invocation—*direct* invocation—of the Blessed Virgin, and of the Saints and Angels, but which contains prayers and exercises for putting this doctrine into practice. Littledale has written a preface to this work. In it he replies to objections to the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, and, while advocating the practice, declares that although it is not *absolutely* binding, yet if a person choose to neglect it he thereby "fails to avail himself of a privilege" (page xii). Here is a short list of the contents of his new book.

First there are "Vigils or wakes of the departed," taken, we are told, "from the old service books of English use," a "use" existing, by the way, when the "Romish doctrine of Purgatory" (39 articles) was in full sway. Besides several prayers

and litanies for the "faithful departed" we also have—what do you think? "*The Rosary* for the faithful departed!" (page 104). There are also exercises for the 21st of November, which day we are told is observed "in honor of our Lady's being presented in the Temple," (page 167), and the *recitation of the Five Joyful Mysteries of the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary is recommended as a pious method of observing the feast*. One of the "Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome" is the use of the Rosary—an idolatrous custom to be repudiated by all "true Catholics." It appears, then, that the Rosary is "idolatrous" only when it is necessary to concoct "Reasons" against persons becoming Catholics, but for Ritualists, who desire to go in for "all Roman doctrine" without submitting to the Church which alone teaches it, it is a "pious and edifying devotion." Besides the Rosary there are litanies and prayers addressed directly to the Blessed Virgin, with the "pray for us," as in the Catholic Church. Then follow other litanies and prayers addressed to different saints and angels, invoking their aid and intercession, in language similar to that of our books of devotion.

Then again, compare the following language used with respect to the Blessed Virgin in "Devotions for the Communion of Saints" with the charges brought against us by the Vicar, and by Littledale in "Plain Reasons," of "idolatry," "extravagant expressions," "impious utterances," etc., etc.

"Hail and rejoice, O most Blessed, most pure, and most honorable Virgin Mary! O most illustrious Star of the Sea! Who shinest more brightly than all others over the darkness of this world. . . . Behold I praise and salute Thee, O most Holy Virgin, mother of my Lord" (page 195).

According to Littledale's "Devotions, etc.," the Blessed Virgin is a *dispenser of grace*—hardly in accord with "Plain Reasons." Read:

"Hail full of Grace! Let thy charity overflow, then, upon us, for *wherefore art thou full, if not to dispense of thy fullness!* Let thy fountains be dispersed abroad; even thy prayers for us exiles in this vale of tears" (page 197).

Again :

"O most holy Virgin, who is able to measure the fullness of grace which thou hast above all the saints ? They were little rivers ; but thou, according to thy name, art full like the sea " (page 205).

Once more, the following prayer to our Lady scarcely harmonizes with the views expressed in " Plain Reasons " :

" And I also, O Lady, praise, bless, and glorify thee, and rejoice that thou art praised, blessed, and glorified by all generations of faithful Christians ! And I beseech thee remember me in thy prayers, that I may obtain all the blessings which thy Son's Incarnation purchased for me " (page 207).

Or again the following :

" Holy and Immaculate Virginity ! with what praises to address thee I know not " (page 247).

But I must stop. There is Littledale—the ritualistic Dr. Jekyll and the anti-Catholic Mr. Hyde, the liar and the hypocrite. The picture is perfect. I wish I had time to expand it, but have I not proved my case ? And this is the man who is permitted to speak, even in the pages of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, against the Catholic Church and her religious Orders. This is the *honest* man who charges the Catholic Church with " idolatry " and " corruption " because her children practice the very doctrine which he, as an Anglican Minister, does his best to promote among the members of his own church. This is the Littledalean morality—and not " adapted " from St. Liguori either, the very spawn of which has reached even to this city. It comes simply to this : Anglicans can go to *any* extremes in Catholic practices, but if they seem disposed to waver in their allegiance to Anglicanism and its teachings, they must be taught that these same doctrines, however good when held by Anglo-Ritualists, are to be regarded in the Catholic Church, their true home, as " Impious," " Infidel," " Idolatrous." This is the plan which Littledale and his satellites adopt the world over, to prevent, if possible, Ritualists from becoming Catholics.

Now, there are, perhaps, few spectacles more calculated to draw tears from angels and mockery from devils, than that of good men led astray in pursuit of a shadow, whilst the living reality is there present before them, if they would but open their eyes to see it. To distract virtuous souls from a real good by its false semblance, is no new artifice of man's great enemy; but it would be difficult to find a more lamentable instance of it, than Ritualism affords. Having catalogued to his own satisfaction, in his *first* Letter, the "enormities" of the Catholic Church, the Vicar appeals to me and to my fellow-Catholics in these words:

"Surely it is the duty of all lovers of "the truth as it is in Jesus," *i.e.*, all true Catholic Christians, *to come out of a Church* which puts its imprimatur upon such idolatrous worship as this, and it ill becomes one who accepts such extravagances to chide those who, for fear of them, fall short of their duty."

Thus far had he got, when a loud burst of laughter of his own conscience at itself rang out through his soul. This convulsion of irony sent cold shivers through all his nerves, and reduced him to such a state of syncope, that his words of invitation to join the "Mission Church," if uttered, were drowned in the din and have not reached us. Let the will stand for the deed. I will take up the broken chord. Ours, in addressing the Vicar and his friends, shall be those words of St. Cyprian, and I honestly and fearlessly utter them:

"Think not that you must maintain the Gospel of Christ while you separate yourselves from the flock of Christ, and from its peace and concord. . . . And since our unity of soul and heart may in no wise be broken; and because we cannot leave the Church and come over to you, we invite and beseech you with all possible entreaty, to return to Mother Church and to a brotherhood of communion with us."

It is one of the last efforts of the enemy of souls, when he sees devout and earnest persons casting a wistful look Rome-wards, to distract them and turn aside their half-formed resolves, by unpractical schemes, delusions, and snares. Human responsibility is always independent of circumstances—at least

before God. Rev. Mark Pattison missed the stage-coach on the morning when he was to be received into the Catholic Church with Newman, and he swung off into—? The stream of time flows quickly, though insensibly. The morning grows into mid-day; and lo! it is evening and the shadows of night gather round. If you have doubts about your present position—doubts unsatisfied; doubts smothered or laid aside; and you do nothing—and the end comes; how will you stand “at the great assize”? Meanwhile, by God’s mercy, you are still alive. You may still have real peace through the one Truth, for—

The Spirit of the Truth, and the Catholic Roman church, the Bride of Christ, say to you, Come. And he who listens to the call and is converted, let him carry on the invitation, and say to others, Come. And let him that thirsteth after truth and peace and grace, Come. And whoever has but the honest will, let him receive the celestial stream, which flows ever from the Seven Sacraments of Life. It shall cost him nothing; for Christ Jesus has purchased these mercies for all by His Precious Blood.

“Et Spiritus, et Sponsa, dicunt,

VENI:

Et qui accedit, dicat

VENI:

Et qui sitiāt.

VENIAT:

Et qui vult, accipiat aquam vitæ gratis.”

Apoc. xxii. 17.

I will conclude in my next with some critico-biblical remarks on *Ipsa*, “for the benefit of Biblical students.”

LETTER XXVIII.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—When discussing the academic aspect of our question, I disclaimed any intention of investigating and weighing the critical value of the reading *Ipsa*. My object then was to

prove that *in Latin* (of which Bishop Kingdon spoke), the reading of *Genesis* iii. 15 was *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, and not *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, simply. Again, I was intent on making very clear to your readers that neither what the Vicar calls the "cultus of the Virgin," nor the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception owes anything whatever to the last clause of the Protevangel; and much less did they owe anything to the present reading of the Vulgate. On these points I have left not a shadow of reason for the assertions made by my opponents, and I commend what I have written to the attention of the next Lambeth Conference.

I will now address myself to a brief exposition of the critical argument in favor of *Ipsa*, based upon data supplied by Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldaic, Greek, and Latin authority.

To refresh the memory of your readers, and to enable them to fully estimate the grossness of Bishop Kingdon's blunder, I will here give the GLOBE's report of his words as follows: "Sometimes the substitution of one letter for another made a vast difference, and as an illustration of this (the Bishop) referred to the words *Ipsa* and *Ipsa*, the latter word in an important passage in the Douay Bible being the foundation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception." The "*Douay Bible*," remember! But let us charitably suppose that this was a *lapsus linguae*, and that the Bishop meant the *Vulgate*. Even then, however, the statement displays disgraceful ignorance or a reckless disregard of truth; because he would lead his hearers to imagine that the reading *Ipsa* was only to be found in the Latin Version or Versions, and it was only in this way that he could work up his "anecdote" about a "misprint." Let us, therefore, examine the fountain-heads.

And first as to the Hebrew, the original *par excellence*. Now there are *eight* Hebrew MSS. in favor of *Ipsa*, three of which are absolutely certain, and five doubtful—" *Tria hebraica certo, quinque dubie*," says Patrizi. In this connection I would draw attention to the great critical principle, first laid down by Bengel, but not fully established and acted upon till the publication of Griesbach's Recensions, that the testimonies in favor of a various reading have not an individual force

independent of the recension or family to which they belong ; and that a reading must be decided, not by the *number* of distinct authorities, but by the *weight* of the recension which contains it.

My next Hebrew authority is the famous Hebrew interlineary edition of the Bible, published in 1572 by the learned Plantin, under the inspection of Boderianus. This has *Ipsa*, or rather the Hebrew equivalent—*Hi*. Plantin also published the great Polyglot Bible of Alcala, containing the Hebrew, Chaldaic, Greek, and Latin texts. This work was done under the direction of Arias Montanus, whose own edition of the Royal Bible, in Latin, has *Ipsum*, as I have already pointed out. Again, besides this interlineary edition, there are *two* other editions of the Hebrew Bible published at Venice in 1776, both of which have *Ipsa*.

I now ask your readers' attention to the testimony of the illustrious Jewish scholar, Maimonides, A.D. 1135–1204. The *Encyc. Britannica* says of him : "He was the greatest theologian and philosopher the Jews ever produced, and one of the greatest the world has seen to this day." His greatest and most learned work is entitled the *Guide of the Perplexed*, in Hebrew *Moreh Nebukhim*. This was written in Arabic and translated into Hebrew by himself. In this work Maimonides reads the Hebrew, *Hi*—*Ipsa*, or, what is the same thing, *Illa*. The book is translated into Latin by Buxtorf, the great German Hebraist, and the most eminent Oriental scholar of his day. I give the words from Buxtorf (P. II., Cap. XXX.) as follows : "Sed mirandum magis est quod serpens cum Eva jungatur, hoc est, semen illius cum hujus semine, caput et calcaneus quod *ILLA* (Eva) vincat ipsum (serpentem) in capite, et ille (serpens) vincat ipsam in calcaneo." To this the "Editio Justiniana" adds these words : "Hoc est quod dictum est, *Ipsa* conteret caput tuum—This is what is said—*She shall crush thy head*." Your readers will notice that Maimonides, being a Jew, does not refer the Woman's seed to Christ, but to Eve. Christians, however, who by reason of the fulfilment of the prophecy in Christ, now know that He is the seed of the Woman who is to crush the serpent's head, refer it to Him.

But this does not affect the testimony of Maimonides to the *feminine* reading in this place, and I do not know where to look for higher authority on the Hebrew text. I must not argue the matter, however, since my present purpose is only to give your readers a strictly impartial account of facts in this matter just as I find them. The Vicar, however, makes an admission, based on *Appleton's Cyclopaedia*, Vol. II., 610, which supports my opinion on the authority of Maimonides. He says: "A most careful recension of the Hebrew text was made in the Middle Ages by eminent Jewish scholars, with the aid of the largest possible collection of MSS., who in their writings speak of famous copies now lost whose use they enjoyed." Now Maimonides was living in the midst of these Jewish scholars, he was the most eminent among them, and he adopts *Ipsa* as the true Hebrew reading. Surely the inference to be drawn is strongly in its favor.

Before passing to the Arabic authorities, I submit a few other considerations on the Hebrew text. We have very little knowledge of the primitive text, and no MSS. older than the ninth century; while of those we have very few can be deemed older than the twelfth century. Since the days of Kennicott and De Rossi, modern research has discovered various MSS. beyond the limits of Europe, and Patrizi's statement, already quoted, proves this. Now, we know that in the Hebrew as primitively written, the *masculine* form of the pronoun was used of the *feminine* also, and that it would represent alike *Ipse* or *Ipsa*; so that from the simple form no argument could be drawn as to its gender. This, Pusey himself confesses, is "one of the observed archaisms of the Pentateuch"; and indeed it is a favorite argument among scholars for the superior antiquity of this part of the Old Testament. Fortunately, I am able here to refer your readers to a work, easily accessible, in absolute proof of this proposition. In the *Encyc. Britannica*, Vol. XI., p. 597, Prof. Robertson Smith, now of Oxford, shows that the old Hebrew orthography was *Hu* and *Hi*, *Ipse* and *Ipsa*, indifferently. He gives the Hebrew characters with and without the modern vowel-points. Not until about the sixth century was this changed. Then the

Masorete doctors (from *Masora*, tradition), Jewish grammarians, introduced their famous thirteen vowel-points so-called, *to mark the pronunciation only* for the public readers of the sacred volume, Hebrew having become a dead language. But to-day the Jews in their synagogues use Bibles without points (though I have not been able to verify by personal inspection this statement of a learned writer), and from these, therefore, the gender of the pronoun cannot be determined. Opponents of this view would point out that since the verb *conteret* is masculine in Hebrew, the pronoun must be masculine. To this I have replied in my *Résumé* by showing that it is a common thing in the Hebrew Scriptures to join pronouns and verbs of the masculine gender with nouns of the feminine, and I need not repeat the references in proof. On this very interesting and important point in the critical argument, I beg to refer your curious readers to Ewald's Hebrew grammar, Book II., § 184; Gesenius' Heb. Gram., Cap. I., § 33; but especially to Roorda's Heb. Gram., Book III., § 88, where the Hebrew characters are given with and without vowel-points, and the matter fully discussed. I also refer them to Cardinal Patrizi's work, entitled, "De Feminini Generis Enallage in Linguis Semiticis Usitata"—"The Enallage of the Feminine Gender occurring in the Semitic Languages," with his thirty-five canons on the same.

There are *two* Arabic editions of the Bible having *Ipsa*, one published in 1671, the other in 1752.

There is *one* MSS. copy of the Chaldaic version that has *Ipsa*.

So much for Semitic authority in support of the unfortunate "misprint," and I will now examine Greek sources.

I have already spoken of the splendid Hexapla (six-fold) Bible of the great Origen. It was six-columned, and contained the Hebrew text in Hebrew characters, and the same text in Greek letters, with the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and the Church version of the Septuagint. Its object was to exhibit the discrepancies between them, and to correct the last when necessary. Nothing now remains of this monumental work but fragments. Fortunately, Montfaucon

has gathered these into two volumes. In Vol. I., p. 18, I find the Greek *aute sou teiresei Kephaleu*, that is *Ipsa conteret caput tuum*. He gives the masculine "*Autos-Ipse*" as well; but of "*Aute-Ipsa*" he says: "Ita MSS. quidam, et haec videtur fuisse, lectio veteris cujusdam interpretis, cujus nomen taceatur, et quem sequitur Vulgatus interpres,—so some MSS. and this appears to have been the reading of some old translator, whose name we know not, and whom the translator of the Vulgate follows." And so we have the authority of Origen (A.D. 186) for *Ipsa*, supported by Montfaucon from Greek MSS.

To those let me add the Latin translator of St. John Chrysostom, and the Latin translator of Josephus, who was Epiphanius the Scholastic, A.D. 510. I have before me the Greek of Josephus, the Latin rendition, with the Latin comment thereon of Havercamp, the best editor of Josephus. But my limits permit no comment.

I now pass to the Latin version. The existence of a Latin version which was made at latest as early as A.D. 150 is certain. It is considered by competent critics to be probable that there were two such versions, one Italian, called the *Vetus Itala*—the old Itala; the other African. Time does not permit me fully to discuss the vexed question—which of these has claims to the greater authority, which can justly be considered the true representative of the original version? My present purpose does not require anything so elaborate. Speaking of the *Itala* St. Augustine says:

"But among the translations themselves the *Itala* is to be preferred to all others; for it is more rigorously observant of words and has also greater perspicuity—in ipsis autem interpretationibus *Itala* ceteris præferatur; nam est *verborum tenacior*, cum perspicuitate sententiæ."

On this passage great Biblical and theological writers have based an almost universally received hypothesis that there existed in the early Western Church one authentic version called the *Vetus Itala*—the Old Itala, the first Latin translation of the Scriptures, and that it was used by the early African Church, which thus received its Bible as it did its faith, from

Rome, the fountain of Christianity. Acting upon this supposed certainty three erudite writers—Nobilius, Bianchini, and Sabbatier—have labored to reconstruct this version indifferently from the quotations of all the Fathers, without regard to country. Now what do these great writers say about *Ipsa*? I have delayed this Letter in the hope to receive from Europe verified extracts from Nobilius and Bianchini, but they have not come to hand. I am able, however, to speak of Sabbatier, who says that the Old Itala, the first Latin translation has *Ipsa*. May we not surely conclude, that Nobilius and Bianchini say the same thing, since they go over the same ground? See Sabbatier, *Bib. Sac. Lat. Vers., Ant. ad Gen.* iii. 15; T. 1, p. 19.¹ If this be the true state of the case, *Ipsa* is the oldest reading, and this is confirmed by the fact that it spread with lightning rapidity all over Europe, in a time when there were no railroads or steamboats to bridge over the distance between widely separated peoples. Consider, too, the authority of these two gigantic minds—St. Ambrose and St. Augustine. The former was consecrated Bishop in A.D. 374. He always uses *Ipsa*, and it must therefore have been in the Codex which he used, and which he had always by him. How did the reading get there? If it had got in ever so surreptitiously, would it

¹ Since writing the above I have been able to examine the works themselves of Bianchini and Nobilius. Bianchini's book—*Vindiciæ Canonicarum Scripturarum*—has nothing on our text. From this as from his later work—*Evangeliorum quadruplex*—he appears to have devoted his attention more especially to the New Testament. The first attempt to reconstruct the Old Italic Version was made by Flaminius Nobilius. He gathered up all the quotations from this translation which he could find in the writings of the Fathers. The missing passages he supplied by a translation of the Greek after the Vatican MSS. This has *Autos-Ipse* in our text, and Nobilius therefore gives *Ipse*. His work, however, is necessarily incomplete. It was printed at Rome in 1588—more than a century before the period when the discovery of MSS. began to excite scholars. Sabbatier, a Benedictine monk of the celebrated Congregation of St. Maur, published his magnificent work in 1743. He collected all the fragments which had come to light since the time of Nobilius, and his volumes remain to-day the basis of all the researches since made upon the subject.

have been able to escape the careful study of this vigilant Bishop? Could he have been free from suspicion about its correctness? Could he have received an innovation so singular, and not only have adopted it with an improbable credulity, but have done so without informing his theological readers (who would naturally be surprised at this innovation on the old reading), what had induced him to admit the alteration? Or are we to suppose that he never had the smallest suspicion of any other reading? This supposes that he, a Bishop and learned Doctor of the Church, was so contented with his one copy of the sacred text, as never to have even collated it with all the older manuscripts, Latin and Greek, in which the *masculine* pronoun may have been retained. Yet surely this is simply incredible.

Again, how does it come to pass, that the erudite St. Augustine always uses *Ipsa*, without dropping a hint about the reading being new or doubtful? When at Milan, immediately after his conversion, and when he frequented the school of Ambrose, he must surely have consulted the Codices there; and also afterwards at Rome where he wrote and published his Soliloquies and other works. On his return to Africa, where he became Bishop, he still adhered to the Old *Itala*. And, moreover, the question of Latin versions generally seems to have attracted his particular attention, for he says: "The skill of those who desire to know the divine Scriptures must be on the watch, that MSS. not emended may give place to such as are emended." It is plain from his writings that he had great love for the works of St. Cyprian, an African Father who, with Tertullian, also an African, uses *Ipsa*. Yet notwithstanding all this, Augustine never makes any explanation, any apology, suggests no doubt, but uses what is to-day our received text. But more. Writing in Africa, and in the face of the *masculine* reading in the pages of St. Cyprian and Tertullian open before him, the great Bishop expressly and emphatically declares, in words already quoted: "Among the translations, the *Itala* is to be preferred to all others, for it is more rigorously observant of words (*tenacior verborum*, more closely accurate), and has also greater perspicuity." To break the weight of St.

Augustine's authority, the Vicar quotes from Canon Westcott these words: "He (St. Augustine) was not endowed with critical sagacity or historical learning, and had very little knowledge of Greek." This is characteristic of a man who can swallow *whole* the calumnies of a Littledale, and is so lost to all sense of self-respect as to offer to your intelligent readers the anonymous scribblings of "Janus" and "Quirinus" as authorities in an argument. Westcott, however, only repeats the nonsense of the elder Rosenmuller, whose language about St. Augustine is worthy of a writer who gives the first rank, among Christian commentators, to the infamous Pelagius and Julian!

But a vindicator of St. Augustine, in this particular, against Westcott and all "smaller fry," has not been wanting. A learned Protestant writer, Dr. Henry Clausen, in a work entitled "*Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis Sacræ Scripturæ Interpres*," published at Copenhagen, has placed the merits of the great Bishop, as a Biblical scholar, in a very different light. He proves that he was sufficiently acquainted with Greek to make a useful application of it in his Commentaries; that he has laid down clearly all those principles "which are the stamina and first elements of chaste and sound criticism"; that he has both diffusely given and condensed all the best maxims of hermeneutics; that by the good use of these, joined to his natural sagacity and the greatness and subtlety of his genius, he has been most happy in elucidating the obscurities of Scripture; in confuting, by accurate research, the erroneous interpretations of others; and that he has frequently removed difficulties by acutely penetrating the views of the inspired writers, and adducing parallel texts. When the Vicar has again "six weeks" to devote to the Fathers, I would recommend to him the study of the Saint's work "*Against Faustus*," where he will find critical rules for deciding among conflicting "various readings." The "yard stick" is gone out of use. St. Augustine's order is, first, to consult MSS. containing a more true or genuine text; secondly, to weigh the number; thirdly, to examine the antiquity of the testimonies; and fourthly, if the point still remains undecided, to recur to the originals. Now,

as St. Augustine always practiced what he preached, your readers will easily believe that by such investigation he reached the conclusion that *Ipsa* was the true reading of Genesis iii. 15. But we do not find it recorded that he ever exhibited any diagram to his people, by which he sought to impress upon their minds the "terrible consequences" arising from the "misprint" *Iipse*, which St. Cyprian had used. Evidently St. Augustine taught what his fellow-Catholics teach to-day, that it makes not a particle of doctrinal difference whether *Iipse*, *Ipsa*, or *Ipsum* be read, since he found all three in the Hebrew, Latin, and Greek MSS. about him. Your readers will find an interesting discussion on the *Old Itala* and African versions among Cardinal Wiseman's essays. This great linguist argues for the African origin of the first Latin translation, and his theory is heartily adopted by the learned Anglican canons, Westcott and Hort, and others. But, Father Gams, a Benedictine monk, has simply annihilated the arguments and conclusions of the Cardinal and his followers.

I now proceed to fulfill a promise made some time ago. In his fifth letter the Vicar said :

"I am *credibly informed* that no instance is to be found in any Ecclesiastical writer of even the corrupt reading *Ipsa* being interpreted of the Blessed Virgin till St. Bernard's time (12th century)."

Here we have Oxford scholarship at its high-water mark,—the whole contingent "trotted out" to back up such brazenly disgraceful ignorance. By what blind fatuity are such people led to attack the Catholic Church ! Let me once more instruct those "educated English gentlemen."

What will your readers say when I tell them that I now have before me the Greek and the Latin of TWENTY-EIGHT ecclesiastical writers who interpret *Ipsa* of the Blessed Virgin, beginning with St. Ephrem (A.D. 362) and ending with St. Bernard, besides others later than St. Bernard. To save my now limited space I will give but a few. The Vicar and his "learned friends" can have the rest—*on demand*. I hold myself ready to accommodate them.

To commence with St. Ephrem. Addressing the Blessed

Virgin, he says: "*Salve paradisi deliciarum. . . . Salve pura quæ draconis nequissimi caput contrivisti et en abyssum projecisti vinculis constrictum*—Hail, Paradise of delights. . . . Hail, thou pure one who crushed the head of the most wicked dragon and hurled him bound in chains into the abyss." I will make the quotations as short as possible.

Omitting St. Proclus and Tarasius, both of Constantinople, and Chrysippus of Jerusalem, I give one from Pusey's *second* volume, which the Vicar either did not see or suppressed. Hesychius of Jerusalem, writes:

"'Lo a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and they shall call His Name Emmanuel.' 'Lo, a Virgin!' What Virgin? She who is the chosen of women, the elect of Virgins, the excellent ornament of our race, the boast of our day, who freed Eve from shame and Adam from threat, *who cut off the boast of the dragon*, when the smoke of desire and the word of soft pleasure hurt her not."

Prudentius writes:

Hoc odium vetus illud erat,
Hoc erat aspidis atque hominis
Digladiabile discidium,
Quod modo cernua femineis
Vipera proteritur pedibus.

Translated: "Hence came the enmity of old between the serpents and man, that inextinguishable feud—*that now the Viper prostrate beneath the woman's feet lies crushed and trampled on.*"

I have given this with another stanza in my *Résumé*. Your readers will remember that the Vicar, not being able to meet it, adopted the ritualistic tactics and cried out—"A forgery!" He promised, however, to consult "friends in England" about it. I *do* hope they can help him out! Prudentius was a Spaniard by birth, and died A.D. 405.

My next authority is Claudius Marius Victor, whom Sidonius calls a "most illustrious and learned man." He was a native of Marseilles, and flourished about A.D. 426. He wrote a Commentary on the Book of Genesis in verse, in which he introduces our text after this manner:

“ Pedibus repes et pectore prono,
Teque tuo Mulier perimet cumsemine, cujus
Callidus extremis tantum insidiabere plantis
Ut trepidans etiam capiti vestigla figat.”

Here the Almighty addresses the serpent :

“Thou shalt crawl on thy prostrate breast, and the woman for whose heel thou shalt lie in wait with so much cunning, will crush thee together with thy seed, so as even with triumphant eagerness to plant her feet upon thy head.”

These two writers well illustrate the facts which I have given about *Ipsa*. They prove that the *feminine* reading was the authorized and popular reading, since it appears as a matter of course in the religious works and even poetry of parts of the world so distant from each other as Milan, Africa, Spain, and France. And all this in days prior to steam and electricity. Moreover, St. Prudentius and Victor were both laymen, and would be sure to adopt the popular version; and I have even a more forcible quotation from Prudentius. Who can believe, in presence of these facts, that the reading crept for the first time into the Latin versions either in the days of St. Ambrose or St. Augustine, as Pusey and his counterfeits ignorantly assert?

My space is contracting, but I am sure your readers will thank me for my next quotation. It is taken from St. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, the most distinguished among all the Christian poets from the sixth to the eighth century. He became Bishop A.D. 490, dying in 525. His six poems are in hexameter verse. They are: “The Creation,” (*De Initio Mundi*); “Original Sin,” (*De Originali Peccato*); “The Judgment of God,” (*De Sententia Dei*); “The Deluge,” (*De Diluvio Mundi*); “The Passage of the Red Sea,” (*De Transitu Maris Rubri*); and, “In Praise of Virginity,” (*De Consolatoria Laude Castitatis*), etc., addressed to his sister. The first three constitute what is called the “Paradise Lost” of St. Avitus. They were published in the sixteenth century, and from them Milton borrowed for his work. Guizot writes of them as follows :

"On pourrait l'appeler le *Paradis Perdu*. Ce n'est point par le sujet et le nom seuls que cet ouvrage rapelle celui de Milton ; *les ressemblances sont frappantes* dans quelques parties de la conception générale et dans quelques-uns des plus importants détails."

And he often gives the palm to St. Avitus. See Guizot's *Histoire de la Civilisation en France* ; Gucheval : *De sancti Aviti Viennæ episcopi operibus*, Thèse (1863).¹

The Vicar may desire to consult his "friends in England"—the poems may be "forgeries"! Rome cannot be trusted, you know.

I quote from "The Judgment of God," the Creator's words to the serpent :

Praecipue in felix mulier, cum prole futura,
Tecum inimicitias odio constante reponet,
Seminibusque tuis ejus cum semine bellum
Perpetuum, sed dissimilis Victoria, nam qui
Ambos una opera vicisti, subdole Serpens,
Olim erit ut sexum muliebrem pronus adores,
Cujus tu quanquam pavidæ insidiabere calci,
Conteret una caput tandem tibi femina victrix,
Nascendumque etiam tali de stipite germen.

¹ Since the above was written, the extent of Milton's debt to St. Avitus has been made apparent by a learned Protestant writer in the *Atlantic Monthly*, January, 1890, in the article "A Precursor of Milton." It is exceedingly interesting to mark how faithfully the great Puritan poet copies and translates the saintly Catholic Bishop. At the close of his essay the writer asks :

"Why did Milton announce himself as undertaking

'Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme' ?

In view of his familiarity with Avitus the claim is audacious, not to say mendacious. M. Guizot, in reference to Avitus, says that Milton could afford to imitate, for he could create. In this view there may be a Protestant indulgence for the great Puritan poet ; a Roman Catholic would probably judge him more severely. Without theological partiality, one cannot but ask, How could he stoop to rob the forgotten dead ? He has rifled a venerated tomb. Let us forbear to push the accusation."

The last four lines freely translated: "But a day will come when you will cringe before the female sex, and although you will lie in wait for her timorous heel, ultimately one woman victorious over you will crush your head, as will also the seed to be born of her."

I will give but one more poetical quotation, for the benefit of your classical readers. It is from Lipsius, who with Isaac Casaubon and Joseph Scaliger were called the "*Literary Triumvirate*."

Et quem non genium fuget,
Et quam non striga, quam sagam
Magna magni Dei parens?
De qua sacra profantur,
Hanc fore quae serpentis
Contereret caput improbi.

This is not to count against the Vicar, since Lipsius lived long after St. Bernard, having been born A.D. 1547. But why did he not read Pusey's *second* volume? Ah! he does not like it. Here are some examples of the use of *Ipsa* in connection with Mary. At p. 324, St. John Damascene, A.D. 731 (once sneered at in the "Mission Church"), says of the Blessed Virgin:

"In this Eden *the serpent found no stealthy entrance*. . . . For the Only begotten Son of God Himself . . . formed Himself Man of this Virgin and pure field."

Again, at p. 300, Pseudo-Origen (some Latin writer later, Pusey thinks, than St. Jerome, A.D. 385) represents an angel addressing mothers in these words: "Hear ye, that a virgin shall be with child, . . . *who was neither deceived by persuasion of the serpent, nor infected by his venomous breath*." And again at p. 161, the great St. Bruno, A.D. 1086, fifty years perhaps before St. Bernard, writes:

"The first head of this line is Adam; the second is Christ. This line begins in Eve and ends in Mary. In the beginning was death; and in the end is life. Death was caused by Eve; life was restored through Mary. Eve was conquered by the Devil; *Mary bound and conquered the Devil*. For since the line is extended from Eve to her, in her at length that Hook was bound and Incarnate, through

whom that Leviathan was taken, the old Serpent who is the Devil and Satan, that he who entered his Kingdom through a woman, should be drawn out of his Kingdom through a woman."

Your readers can now form an estimate of the value of *any statement* made by the "educated English gentlemen" from Oxford, and their "learned friends."

POSTSCRIPT.

I am happy to offer to my readers some interesting evidence in support of *Ipsa*. It is nothing less than the famous Codex Amiatinus, the oldest and most excellent of all the Latin MSS., now in the Laurentian Library, Florence. It contains the whole Vulgate Bible except the Book of Baruch. The witness through whom I introduce it is Tischendorf. Among Protestants he is confessedly the most consummate of Biblical critics, since he is said to have "crowned the edifice" of Biblical Criticism. In 1873, shortly before his death, completing the work of Heyse, he edited this MS. in his critical edition of the Latin Old Testament, now before me. In the text he gives *Ipsa*, and in his note thereon, after discussing its origin, he very clearly and simply states the Catholic meaning of it thus: "*Ipsa*, i.e., *mulier per semen suum*—SHE, that is, the woman through her seed," shall crush the serpent's head. This is what I have repeated over and over again. The learned Protestant Grotius expresses agreement with Tischendorf in these words (already quoted): "The Vulgate has *Ipsa*, as if it were spoken of the woman, but in a sense not improper."

Tischendorf also gives a beautiful fac-simile specimen of this great MS., in large uncials, in which our text reads thus: "*IPSA CONTERET CAPUT TUUM.*"

Here again I beg to refer my readers to Bishop Walton's Polyglot Translations of the Chaldaic Paraphrases. In the paraphrase of Jonathan-ben-Ussel, the common opinion of the ancient Hebrews when explaining *Genesis* iii. 15, is expressed as follows: "A remedy will truly exist for them (Adam and Eve), but not for thee (the tempter); for *they* shall crush thy heel in the latter days, in the days of the King

Messiah." Again, to accentuate the bond which identifies Mary—the Woman—with the combat and triumph of her seed, the Chaldaic Paraphrasers use one sole pronoun which embraces the two readings—*Ipse*, *Ipsa*, and they read: "THEY shall bruise thy head." See *Dissertations on the Messiah*, by Jacqueslet, p. 79; *First Letter from a Converted Rabbīn*, p. 57.

Let me say a parting word on St. Jerome's testimony. He published his version of the Pentateuch A.D. 404. In his translation, at least in what is supposed to be the genuine transcript, as it has been published by Vallarsius and Maffei, he uses *Ipse*; furthermore, he adopts it in his book *De Quaest. Hebraicis in Gen.*, where he is writing critically. But in his own works, in common with St. Augustine and the rest, he adopted *Ipsa* (See *Comment. in Isaiam*, I. xvi., c. 58, *in vers.* 12). This surely affords us another and independent proof of the antiquity and authority of *Ipsa*. For, that such an enthusiast for the Hebrew text, as St. Jerome proved himself to be, should have retained a reading, which he rejected as a Biblical scholar, is inconceivable—except on the hypothesis that it was already so strongly stereotyped in the memory of the faithful, as to deter him from attempting to innovate upon it in his exegetic works (See Father Harper, l. c.).

I have before me, and beg to refer my classical readers to the learned work of the Jesuit, Father Corluy, Professor of Sacred Scripture in Louvain University, entitled: *Spicilegium Dogmatico-Biblicum*.

R. F. Q.

LETTER XXIX.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I have now a word to say on *Ipsūm*. We have throughout this discussion been speaking of Latin words—*Ipse*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsūm*, and the masculine, feminine, and neuter genders in Greek, Latin, and English. As in French, so in

Hebrew and the cognate Semitic languages, there is no neuter gender; but for the sake of simplicity, and to accommodate myself to the mode of speech used by the Latin writers whom I quoted, I made no distinction, in respect of gender, between Hebrew and Greek and Latin. Here, then, a word of explanation may not be out of place for the unlearned reader.

In Hebrew there are but two forms of the pronoun—"Hu—He" and "Hi—She"; and yet De Rossi, speaking in reference to Latin, says "that the true reading of the sacred text is *Hu, Ipse, Ipsum*." So, many of the Latin authorities which I cited say that the Hebrew text is *Ipsum*, while others say that it is *Ipsa*. Both are correct, since every Hebrew authority for *Ipsa* is also one for *Ipsum*; and it is the same for Greek. In like manner, Pusey, with reference to English, says that the Hebrew text ought to be rendered "It," or "He shall bruise thy head." Thus we see that Greek, Latin, and English writers speak of translation from the Hebrew into their own several languages according to the grammatical capabilities of these languages as to gender. Take, for instance, the Protestant translation of our text in both forms of the pronoun, as directed by Pusey:

"I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her *seed*; It shall bruise thy head," etc.; and

"I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her *seed*; He shall bruise thy head," etc.

In the *first* form, the pronoun "It" remains simply level with its antecedent "*seed*," the mere *word* in the neuter gender, and it expresses nothing more.

In the *second* form, the translator has risen above the mere word "*seed*," seized the idea signified by it, which is Christ, and expressed it by the pronoun "*He*," referring immediately to Christ and only indirectly to "*seed*."

Now, as this mental process is the philosophy of the masculine and the neuter "*He*" and "*It*" in the English Protestant translation, so it is the philosophy of the masculine and the neuter, "*Autos*" and "*Auto*" in the Greek, and "*Ipsa*" and "*Ipsum*" in those Latin translations which reject "*Ipsa*."

As then, when speaking of English, we say that the Hebrew has "*He*" or "*It*," so when speaking of Latin and Greek we say that the Hebrew has "*Ipsē*" or "*Ipsū*" and "*Autos*" or "*Auto*," respectively. Hence Cardinal Patrizi and De Rossi quote their Semitic authorities in support of "*Ipsē*" and "*Ipsū*" indifferently, just as apologists for the Greek "*Autos*" and "*Auto*" would do. Here let me state distinctly that Montfaucon mentions Greek MSS. of the Septuagint, which have the neuter "*Auto*." This is confirmed by Wright in his Book of Genesis in Hebrew, for an extract from which I am indebted to the very obliging and courteous theological Librarian of the Protestant University of Princeton, New Jersey.

Where is Bishop Kingdon's little "diagram"? Echo answers—Where! But, what is more serious, there rests upon him the grave obligation, either to correct his blunder and retract his outrageous misstatement based upon it, or to defend it either by himself, or with the aid of some Vicar qualified for the task. The intelligent public *can* be satisfied with nothing less, and a "teacher in Israel" ought not to be.

I must now gather up a few dropped threads and hasten to a conclusion.

In a short paragraph near the end of his last "Stricture," the Vicar starts a new objection, based on the alleged silence of Scripture, and to the effect that the general spirit of the Gospels is altogether adverse to the Catholic view of the Blessed Virgin. To this particular objection I have not at all addressed myself. I was engaged solely in answering his charges of "Idolatry," "Impiety," "Infidelity," and "Apostasy," which he based upon the *language* of our devotions to her. I felt and know that these charges *do* and *should* influence Protestants more profoundly than any other, and I think your candid readers will admit that I have unanswerably confronted them. This new objection in *twenty lines* would require a series of letters with which I cannot ask to trespass on you now. In reply to it, however, I can maintain, that no conclusion of Euclid is more rigorously demonstrable than is the direct contradictory of this Protestant allegation. The one

implication of the Gospel narrative, I most confidently assert, is that Mary's position is immeasurably exalted above—nay, is essentially different in kind from—that of any other of her Son's redeemed. Will Bishop Kingdon give me the freedom of the Anglican pulpits in this city for *four* consecutive Sundays on this text: "Mary, the Mother of Jesus, in Prophecy and its Fulfilment interpreted by Antiquity?" "Scripture interpreted by Antiquity," is Pusey's standard—the ablest man Anglicanism has had since Cardinal Newman's *reversion*. I will accept that standard *pro hac vice*. My "Orders," too, are all right, and I will not appeal either to a *photograph* of the "Lambeth Register" in proof of their validity, as did he recently, among the "Anecdotes of the Lambeth Conference," in support of his. Or, will Bishop Kingdon lead out his Oxford "contingent"—a dozen if he has them—and calmly discuss the proposition I have alleged, at any time or place, and before any audience? Let there be no shilly-shally about this matter. I want these "English gentlemen" to feel assured that *one* of the "poor Irish" in this Diocese, where "*Romanism is very Low Church*," as the Vicar writes, is ready and able to vindicate against their united forces the position assigned to the ever-blessed mother of his Redeemer, by the Catholic Church, in the divine economy of man's salvation. Your readers have received but an installment of that vindication in this *Rejoinder*—a few pearls from the lap of Holy Church, which I have tried to string into a Rosary to lay in homage at blessed Mary's feet—a few shells from the shore of that boundless ocean of Catholic truth which laves the throne of the Eternal, as an humble reparation for the insults offered her by Anglican Bishops and their Vicars the world over. I have, in this part of my subject, cited no authorities, but consistently and throughout appealed to reason pure and simple. I leave to your attentive readers to say what measure of success has attended my labors. On another occasion, I will give a list of books in which they can make deeper studies.

And now a word on the Strossmayer episode. Since writing on this matter, an important piece of evidence has come to hand in absolute confirmation of what I then proved. Cardi-

nal Manning's word will be taken the world over, at its face. Well, he has written a work entitled, "The True Story of the Vatican Council," in which we get the "true story" of the Vicar's "famous speech of Strossmayer," which he hoped would be so "advantageous to our Church," were it only printed in the *Church Eclectic*. At page 164 of the Cardinal's book, he is speaking of the falsehoods circulated about the doings of the Council, and he proceeds as follows:

"But, in truth, the Italian papers and the *Augsburg Gazette* are the chief sources of these mendacious exaggerations. An Italian paper gave in full the speech of Bishop Strossmayer, who was the subject of one of these Homeric commotions. In that speech he was made to apostrophize by name, as present before him and as a chief offender, a Bishop who was not there at all to be apostrophized. When the speech had gone the round of Europe in a polyglot version, Bishop Strossmayer in a Roman paper denounced it as a forgery, and his letter has again and again been reprinted in England. Nevertheless, the speech is reprinted continually at this day at Glasgow and Belfast, and sown broadcast by post over these kingdoms, and probably wherever the English tongue is spoken."

My copy is printed at Belfast, and on it the announcement is made that "Persons wishing quantities for *gratuitous distribution* will be *liberally treated*." It would be interesting to know what discount the Vicar got on his "gratuitous distributions." This is the document of which the Vicar wrote: "*It is the finest thing I know of on the opposition side!*" Of course the "Strictures" had not then been written—else Strossmayer's "speech" was nowhere. Would it not be "advantageous to our Church" to send *them* to the *Church Eclectic*—without the *Rejoinder*? Because he exposed his crime against Bishop Strossmayer and truth, he has charged me with "defaming" his character; but surely a hawker of forgeries has no character to be defamed, especially when he makes a hypocritical pretence of a fondness for testing his wares by a "yard stick" and "critical apparatus." But perhaps he will plead ignorance of the imposture. It may be; but then he will save but a remnant of honesty at the expense of his judgment, for no intelligent Protestant, not to speak of a "Catho-

lic Protestant," ought to be deceived by the forged "Speech." But let us await the reparation. Meanwhile, I have set a trap to test the honesty of this Oxford innocent, and, ten to one, he will walk straight into it. We will see.

On the subject of Ritualism I have barely touched in these Letters. Beginning with a purely critical question, the Vicar, most insultingly and illogically, introduced and provoked a discussion on Catholic devotion to the Mother of God, and I felt obliged "to run him down." I kept simply to the point, and turned neither to the right nor to the left, till he had disappeared. He has stated his case, given his "wider view of the cultus of the Virgin," and constructed his "treasury of argument" against "Romanists." Of this fabric, builded with so much love, I have left not one stone upon another. The discussion is therefore logically at an end, saving to the Vicar a right to clear himself, if haply he can, from some of the crimes charged and proved against him. To his explanations I, of course, claim the right to reply. Having thus performed my task, I am hereafter a free lance. If he gives me occasion, I will consider Ritualism root and branch—as well in relation to the Catholic Church, her doctrines, rites, and ceremonies, as in relation to the Anglican Church, her Homilies, Articles, Book of Common Prayer and the late Lambeth Conference. From my complete Ritualistic library—"cribs" of Catholic books for the most part—I will exhibit the theological piracy and freebootery by which Ritualism lives, and I will expose its hideous hypocrisy and dishonesty, as it never has been exposed in this city. Remember, I am speaking of *Ritualism*, not *Ritualists* generally, though the Vicar's tactics in this discussion have well illustrated some of its worst vices. Was ever hypocrisy more audacious than to protest to have no desire "of wounding any person's feelings," when he attacks with satanic fury all that we hold to be true and sacred? Was ever hypocrisy carried to a greater extent than his bitter assaults on the character of Popes and Cardinals, Bishops and Priests of the Catholic Church—"not to offend," he says, "but for truth's sake"? *He* talk of truth and charity! *He* talk of candor and honesty! Ah! we have heard before of such champions of sincerity:

The Devil was sick, the Devil a monk would be:
The Devil was well, the *Devil* a monk was he.

Yet, I would not be thought out of sympathy with Ritualism *in itself*, and apart from the hypocrisy which it is made to subserve; because, as the Anglican Dean Hook so well said, it is "doing the work of the Church of Rome while eating the bread of the Church of England." It is one of the best missionaries that the Catholic Church has, inasmuch as it is familiarizing the Protestant mind, and indoctrinating it, with Catholic principles, truths, and views of truths, to which it is such a stranger, but to which, however, it would not listen if they came in full Catholic garb. It gets a hearing for Catholic doctrine in quarters to which the ordinary missionary has no access. It cannot, indeed, be said of every mind: "*Il a saisi la vérité parcequ' il a saisi les ensembles*;" but honest and thoughtful minds in Ritualism, who are earnestly searching for the truth amid the doctrinal chaos of Anglicanism, must sooner or later connect *facts* with the *principles* that give them vitality. To many such, Ritualism has been the vestibule from which they have entered into peace and joy in the bosom of the Catholic Church. The latest example is the Rev. Luke Rivington of Oxford, and I would commend to the Vicar his learned little work, entitled: "Authority; or, a Plain Reason for Joining the Church of Rome," another illustration of the great argument—If Theist, why not Christian, if Christian, why not Catholic, as the true issue of religious polemic to-day.

Another reason for my sympathy with Ritualism is suggested by the beautiful words of St. Augustine: "*Illi in vos sacerviant, qui nesciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur, et quam difficile caveantur errores*:" Let those who rage against you, who know not with what labor truth is discovered, and with what difficulty errors are avoided." God forbid that any Catholic should speak words of bitterness or scorn about those Anglicans and Ritualists who, though it may be with limping gait, are slowly retracing their steps after the wanderings of three hundred years. On the contrary, we should rather kneel in reverence with uncovered heads as they draw nearer. But the bitterest ridicule, the most stinging satire, and the severest re-

crimination would make too light a scourge for those pseudo-*"Priests"* who, while they assume the garments—both literary and material—of the Holy Catholic Church, persuade the wanderers that they are the accredited officers of the Great King, and that the wanderers themselves are already safe in His Kingdom. I have not for a moment shrunk from bringing, and urging, and proving such a charge against the Vicar. "It is the bounden duty," he says, "of those who know the truth to speak out boldly at the risk of exciting anger, opposition, and reproach, or of being misunderstood." I fondly trust that his *candor* will duly appreciate my motive: I, too, have spoken out—"not to offend, but for truth's sake." May God prosper the word, that it fall not on stony ground!

While on this topic, let me inform your readers that Little-*dale's* "Plain Reasons"—the Vicar's theological text-book and "critical apparatus"—has been "kicked out" by the Protestant Association since this discussion commenced. It had become so discredited under the fire of its critics, Protestant and Catholic, that it had to go. My authority for this statement is a London paper which I have unfortunately mislaid, and for which I have lately hunted in vain. This statement, however, can be verified, or corrected, if untrue. Your readers will easily credit it when I tell them that the Rev. Dr. Lee, an Anglican minister, himself very High Church, has pointed out and tabulated *two hundred and one* mistakes, as follows:

Regarding Historical facts,	51
" Dogmatic facts,	43
" Inaccurate quotations from writings on history and Canon Law,	29
Regarding historical and theological quotations half-made, often with remarkable omissions or qualifications,	30
Regarding quotations from the Fathers, which, when sought out, are found to bear an entirely different meaning from that which Dr. Littledale puts upon them,	24
Confusing the <i>personal opinion</i> of Catholics with the defined doctrines of the Church,	17
Assuming that current <i>opinions</i> of theologians are without doubt defined dogmas,	7
Total,	201

Dr. Lee adds: "Every edition of Littledale's book receives fresh corrections, while in several cases the corrections are equally inaccurate with the statement presumed to be corrected." To the edition of 1881, the last I have seen, are prefixed 29 pages of closely printed "additions and corrections"—mainly the latter, in all 13,340 words of *errata*. Pretty good showing for a book of 200 pages! Some other time I will give your readers Littledale's history.¹

At the close of the last "Stricture," the Vicar says: "I shall not shrink from encountering any advocate of (the Immaculate Conception) if you feel disposed to open your columns for the discussion." Ye Gods! Why, I will lay a wager the man does not know any more about it than did Pusey when he wrote the *first* volume of *Eirenicon*, and in using these words he had his eye on Pusey's "Scraps," with which he would like to fill your columns, as he did on other occasions. The *Vicar* discuss the Immaculate Conception! Ha! Ha!! Ha!!! Now, this mild offer to appear in a "wider area than the Institute," implies some knowledge of Theology. And, what is Theology? It is the philosophy of Revelation; in other words, it is the result of applying to revealed dogmata the methods and principles of philosophy. But the Vicar could get no sound Christian philosophy at Oxford, and therefore luckily for himself got none. Oxford, the capital of Anglicanism, has given up the profession of Christianity in its educational capacity. Two anti-Christian philosophies in the very opposite poles of thought are, not so much striving for pre-eminence there as joint-tenants in full possession to-day. Listen to Canon Liddon:

"Cases have come *within my own experience* of men who have come up to school as Christians, and have been earnest Christians up to the time of beginning to read philosophy for the final school, but who, during the year and a half or two years employed in this study, have surrendered first their Christianity and next their belief in God, and *have left the University not believing in a Supreme Being.*"

A similar account is given by Mr. Appleton, a member of

¹ See Appendix C for full text of Dr. Lee's Letter.

the "Select Committee of the House of Lords on University Tests" with Canon Liddon. He says:

"I think it is quite impossible for any man to throw himself into the system of education for the final classical school . . . without having *the whole edifice of his belief shaken to the very foundation.*"—First Report, pp. 44, 69.

This was written seventeen years ago, but we see its practical results to-day in "*Robert Elsmere.*" I say nothing about the argumentative value of the novel, because Anglicanism can attend to its own funeral; but I think it most ungallant of Anglican parsons especially, to rail at the authoress, because she who "knows Oxford well" simply gives an "Oxford picture of Oxford influences," and is only in accord with Canon Liddon. The *Quarterly Review* for October, 1888, says that Christianity is regarded at the college described in the book as an open question, that aspirants for holy orders are told by their tutors that the faith they intend to preach is only a respectable mythology, and that the government and discipline of Oxford are now committed to men who are emancipated from obligations to any form of belief—to philosophical deists and hopeless skeptics. Cardinal Newman's prophecies on "Liberalism" at Oxford have been verified to the letter. See "*Apologia,*" pp. 57-62. Now it is evident that the Vicar never reached the "final schools" described by Canon Liddon, but rather took to Ritualism, which has appropriated to itself enough of Catholic principles and teaching, always "instinct like relics with supernatural power," to justify itself *perhaps* as a phase of Christianity. This, however, is no reason why he should think himself qualified to discuss a theological topic like the Immaculate Conception. Upon this question I have not entered, nor is it now, thanks be to God, at all necessary, for I assure your readers and I am prepared to prove, in any manner acceptable to Bishop Kingdon and his Vicar, that Pusey in his *second* volume, and in published letters and speeches which I have, accepted and believed the doctrine *itself* as defined by the Catholic Church; and more, that he strongly urges its fitness and truth from its analogy to the sanctification of Jeremias and John the Baptist expressly re-

vealed in Holy Scripture. What a triumph for Catholic truth! The greatest and most Catholic-minded intellect, after Newman, that the Anglican Church has ever produced kneeling in homage at Mary's feet! Praised and blessed forever be her Immaculate Conception! Pusey's *second* volume is a perfect *Hosanna* to the Blessed Virgin, and it is a simple delight to a Catholic to read it. Indeed, there is nothing more "advantageous to our Church," in English. By all means, "let every lover of Christian truth secure a copy"! Had the Vicar read it when he gave this advice? Or, is he after all but a "Jesuit in disguise"?

When Pusey wrote the *first* volume of the *Eirenicon* he did not even understand this doctrine, and while Father Newman told him so, he gave him a singularly lucid exposition of it. Afterwards, Pusey went to France and spent some months among the French Bishops, and sojourned notably with the great Dupanloup. On his return to England he wrote the *second* volume, addressed to Father Newman, in which he expresses himself perfectly satisfied with the doctrine as explained by him and Dupanloup. Will the Vicar, after he has carefully studied Pusey's words, dare assert that Pusey *rejects* the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception as defined by the Catholic Church? Of course I must honestly say that I doubt his ability, through lack of theological training, even to read the matters involved understandingly, since Pusey himself displays a strange bewilderment on the meaning of some of the details of the Church's definition. He is modest enough, however, to ask Father Newman, for "an explanation which would remove difficulties" on some speculative aspects of it, but on which the Church has not pronounced.

A few words of advice to the Vicar. While Cardinal Newman was yet an Anglican, he said "hard things," as he confesses, against the Catholic Church. He became a Catholic in October, 1845. Nearly *three years before that*, he drew up and published a document, dated December 12, 1842 (now before me), containing a formal "Retraction" of those "hard things." He had spoken in his writings of doctrines of the Catholic Church as "unscriptural," "profane," "impious,"

"blasphemous"; and said, among other severe things, that "we ought to treat (Popish Rome) as if she were that evil one which governs her." He *closes* his "*peccavi*" document with these words:

"If you ask me how an individual could venture not simply to hold, but to publish such views of a communion so ancient, so wide-spreading, so fruitful in saints. I answer, that I said to myself, 'I am not speaking my own words, I am but following almost a *consensus* of the divines of my church. They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most able and most learned of them. I wish to throw myself into their system. While I say what they say I am safe. Such views, too, are necessary for our position.' Yet I have reason to fear still that such language is to be ascribed, in no small measure, to an impetuous temper, a hope of approving myself to persons I respect and a wish to repel the charge of Romanism."

Remember, this was written while an Anglican minister. Why, then, did he withdraw categorically these "hard things" while still in the Anglican church? *He found out that he had been deceived by the divines of his own church!* Years afterwards, when he had become a Catholic, in the pages of the *Apologia* he told what he meant in the words I have just quoted:

"I was angry," he says, "with the Anglican divines. I thought they had taken me in; I had read the Fathers with their eyes; I had sometimes trusted their quotations or their reasonings; and from reliance on them I had used words or made statements, which properly I ought rigidly to have examined myself. I had exercised more faith than criticism in the matter. . . . I had leaned too much upon the assertions of Ussher, Jeremy Taylor, or Barrow, *and had been deceived by them.*"

Now, Cardinal Newman is the most illustrious Englishman to-day living. Even the Vicar calls him "honest"; but the Vicar himself has used against the Catholic Church in this discussion, and unprovoked by me, the harshest words the language has. Cardinal Newman did the same thing, but, on learning that he had been deceived by his teachers, he honorably withdrew them and as publicly as he had uttered them. The Vicar *must* be satisfied and convinced from my reply and

explanations, that he too has been deceived—in “credibly informed.” If then, like Cardinal Newman, he be an “honest” man he will follow his example—“Go and do likewise.” Let him remember “the great assize,” “the burning lake,” and the unhappy lot of Bellarmine and Baronius.

I would advise the Vicar again: 1. To make himself acquainted with the first principles of Catholic Theology, of which he has shown himself profoundly ignorant. 2. To devote the next five years to getting some knowledge of Christian antiquity, and meanwhile refuse to be “credibly informed” by “learned friends,” who know no more about it than himself. This will save him from a renewal of the disgrace and humiliation brought upon him by his ignorance of the application of *Ipsa* by ecclesiastical writers before the 12th century. 3. Not to dream of understanding the full meaning of the Fathers he may read during this probation, unless he is determined to sympathize most fully with them. Remember the words of Cardinal Newman to Pusey, describing his feelings as an Anglican :

“I recollect well what an outcast I seemed to myself, when I took down from the shelves of my library the volumes of St. Athanasius or St. Basil, and set myself to study them; and how, on the contrary, when at length I was brought into Catholic communion I kissed them with delight, with a feeling that in them I had more than all that I had lost; and, as though I were directly addressing the glorious saints, who bequeathed them to the church, how I said to the inanimate pages, ‘You are now mine, and I am now yours, beyond any mistake.’ . . . The Fathers made me a Catholic, and I am not going to kick down the ladder by which I ascended into the church. It is a ladder quite as serviceable for that purpose now as it was twenty years ago.”

4. Not to be guilty of the disgusting folly and impertinence of crying out “Forgery!” because an inconvenient quotation is made from a writer of whom he knows nothing, and of pressing to his bosom what he ought to *know* to be a forgery, only because it is “advantageous to our Church.” And, finally, that he be quite sure that the arguments he uses against Catholic devotion to the Blessed Virgin are not equally valid

against what he himself considers the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

And now a parting word to Bishop Kingdon, the original offender. When he made the statement that *Ipsa* was a "misprint" for *Ipse*, did he know that at the very moment when the Catholic Church promulgated the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception she was holding in her hand the Roman edition of the Septuagint, the peerless Vatican Codex, prepared as an aid to the revisors of the authentic Vulgate, at the suggestion of Cardinal Perretti (afterwards the great Pope Sixtus V.), and published in the second year of his pontificate, A.D. 1587? Did he know that this king of MSS. has the *masculine* reading, *Autos—He*? An edition of the Vatican Codex by Father Loch, fresh from the press, and dedicated to the illustrious Leo XIII., is now before me. It is the most valuable and authoritative Biblical MS. in the world. "How should "*Protestants*," asks Tregelles, one of the chief among recent Protestant textual critics—"How should *Protestants* have been willing to concede such an honor to this text which had appeared under Papal sanction? It gained its ground and kept it because it was really an ancient text, such in its general complexion as was read by the early Fathers" (Tregelles' "Account of the printed Text of the Greek N. T.," p. 185). But according to Bishop Kingdon the Catholic Church knew nothing about the Vatican Codex. On the contrary, in 1854 she was misled by a "misprint" in the Vicar's "corrupt" Vulgate and she, the "pillar and the ground of truth," "founded" her solemn teaching about the Immaculate Conception of the ever blessed Mother of God upon it! Now, an ordinarily intelligent mind would conclude from the knowledge of the Church and her action on it, that she recognized no doctrinal difference between the *masculine* and the *feminine* reading in Gen. iii. 15, and that she therefore "founded" *nothing* upon it. Alas! She had no "educated English gentlemen" from Oxford at her elbow, to teach her how to read her own documents, and to warn her of the "tremendous importance" of the blunder she was making! Verily, the sight of an Anglican Bishop uttering such words as I have been considering, confirms what a

learned Protestant writer says of the theological requirements for the office, to wit: "The primary qualification for the Anglican Episcopate is ability to conjugate correctly the Middle Voice of the Greek verb."

Here I take leave of my opponents for the present. I am in doubt whether I should say "Good-by," or simply "Au revoir"; I therefore address them in Carlyle's words: "Oh ye hapless two, *mutually extinctive*, sleep ye well in the Mother's bosom that bore you both."

I beg to add only a few more words of a personal sort, and then make an end. The contest has been an unequal one. It is true we are both "busy priests," but from the nature and necessities of my daily occupation, my "clerical" duties have been more exacting than those of my opponent. Nevertheless, I have met him *single-handed and alone*. No unmanly egoism prompts the emphatic declaration that, from beginning to end of this controversy I not only *never asked* from my many "learned friends" *even one question touching it*, but what is more, I *never received even one suggestion regarding it*, directly or indirectly, from any quarter outside of my books. Such of these as I did not have in my own library, I got either from Rome, Paris, London, New York, or elsewhere. I make this declaration in justice to the main subjects discussed, to the end that responsibility for all shortcomings may rest entirely with me. I might well indeed have sought assistance, and received it abundantly, but—to say out honestly what I feel—I thought it a treason to my venerated teachers—Fathers Barry, Varilly, Dixon, Doucet, and Bannon, and to His Lordship Bishop Rogers, *clarum et venerabile nomen*, the founder of my own humble Alma Mater, St. Michael's College. My opponents were *too small* to justify any intellectual fear for the armor she gave me—and their eyes were upon me. Intellectual fear! An instructed Catholic knows not what it is. Why should he fear? The truth of Catholicism rests on historical arguments, which are not only incontrovertible, but in some sense irresistible. "The proof seems," to Cardinal Newman, "such as even to master and carry away the intellect directly it is stated; so that Catholicism is almost its own evidence."

Why should he fear? He is the heir to the wealth,—moral, spiritual, scriptural, philosophical, historical—of nineteen centuries of Christian thought created by the Church whose intellectual life he lives. The atmosphere in which he dwells vibrates with logical thunderbolts, and he has but to put forth his hand and seize them as they go whizzing by. What business has an Anglo-Ritualist with one so equipped? This *Rejoinder* will explain.

Again, I wish to disarm those of your readers who try to divert others from the real points at issue in this discussion by accusations against *me* of bitterness, causticity, and the like. I would remind them that a burglar has no difficulty in keeping his temper; but that when the owner of the house, on rising, finds himself to have sustained grievous loss, he deserves no small praise if he bear that loss with perfect patience. So when an assault is made on the object of a man's dearest attachment—the Catholic Church with all that it implies—he is of course tempted to anger and excitement. A MAN is not expected to argue unmoved with the unjust assailant of the fair fame of his mother, his wife, or his sister. In this case the burglar was caught in the act, but straightaway lost his temper and proceeded to insult where he had tried to injure, pleading zeal for truth in justification. I claim the privilege of the same plea, and neither accuse nor excuse myself for the language in which I have tried to project on the burglar's attention my contempt for his clumsy attempt. Rigorous indignation is one thing; malice, hatred, bigotry, and prejudice quite other things. These, indeed, argue an uncleanness in which I will have no part. They are to me as loathsome as an impure thought deliberately entertained, and with them, as a Catholic, I can have no fellowship. Will ingenuous Protestants please lay this to heart?

And now I have done. To you, Mr. Editor, I beg to renew the expression of my warmest gratitude for your boundless courtesy and tireless patience during the execution of my task.

Ever gratefully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

My opponent replied to the above *Rejoinder* in a series of twenty-three letters. On their conclusion, the Editor of the *GLOBE* declared the only conditions on which the discussion could be continued in its columns. I was to have one column, my opponent the same space afterwards, and then a half-column was to be allowed me to close. Now, so far as the *GLOBE* was concerned, no reasonable man could complain of these terms. We had been treated in the most generous and courteous way, and I doubt if ever before so prolonged a discussion on such serious themes of theological controversy was permitted in newspaper columns. Nevertheless, so far as the matters in debate were concerned, the limits within which the *GLOBE* proposed that I should compress my review, were wholly inadequate to the demands made upon me by my opponent's mode of handling our subjects. Having put my hand to the plough, I must needs go from headland to headland. Therefore I did not accept the *GLOBE*'s terms. Instead, I have prepared for publication in this volume the following *Rebutter*,—a full, fearless, and conscientiously faithful consideration of every attempt at counter-argument made to the *Rejoinder*. For the sake of uniformity, I have preserved the epistolary style, and addressed myself to the Editor and the readers of the *GLOBE*. I have little doubt about the verdict.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A REBUTTER.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—The Vicar recently finished in your columns a *second* series of his *Strictures*, in twenty-three letters. By my *Rejoinder* to his *first* series, I have made his name a watchword of infamy amongst all honest, truth-loving men—*forever*. But no one who has not read the second series can have any conception of the terms—malignity and meanness, platitude and perversity, decrepitude of cankered intelligence, and desperation of humiliated vanity. Here we have the Ritualist pseudo-“priest,” the “Old Catholic” as he styles himself, in full bloom. I propose, however, to look at them *seriatim*, and to give your readers a faithful account of their contents. I will be as brief as possible.

FIRST LETTER.—This is but a lachrymose jeremiad. Like a whipped school-boy he appeals to your readers for sympathy, and complains that some frolicsome young maidens so “demeaned themselves” as to laugh at him. Well, I suppose their plea would be that of the old Greek, St. Gregory Nazianzen: “*Give us leave to be merry on a merry subject.*” That the Vicar has now become such in this community—who doubts?

SECOND LETTER.—To divert public attention from the overwhelming force of my *Rejoinder* on the main question, he devotes this letter to the question of the authenticity of the well-known seventh verse of the fifth chapter of 1 John—“And there are three that give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.” This he calls “the celebrated interpolation,” says it is “omitted now of course in the Revised Version” of the Bible, and he

winds up with the magisterial declaration: "I surrender (!) the interpolation concerning the Three Heavenly Witnesses which the scholarly revisors of the English New Testament have abandoned."

Now, is not such language in the mouth of an Anglo-Ritualist simply disgusting? Why, to-day the Revised Version is of no more authority in the Anglican Church than an old almanac. No Anglican minister (in England at least) can lawfully use it in public worship. Parliament, or the Privy Council representing the Crown, must first appoint or allow it to be read, as is the case with the King James Version. This was proved a little while ago. At a meeting of the London Diocesan Conference a proposal was made to petition Convocation to consider the advisability of permitting the use in public worship of the Revised Version. The proposal was rejected, and during the debate Dr. Wace called attention to the censures on the Revision of Dr. Scrivener, Dean Burgon, and Canon Cook; and he himself protested in particular against the doubt thrown by the Revisors on the close of St. Mark's Gospel and against the rendering, "Deliver us from the evil one," in the Lord's Prayer. Then one minister avowed that he had adopted the Revision in his week-day services; whereupon Bishop Temple interrupted him with the remark that this was illegal, though *personally he would neither prosecute nor allow him to be prosecuted for so doing.*

But what *is* the Revised Version? It is the work of Anglican Bishops, sitting with Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Unitarians—that is, the English Bible improved according to modern ideas of progressive Biblical Criticism! And who gave these men authority over the written Word of God? It was not Parliament, or the Privy Council, but the Church of England acting through Convocation! Who gave Convocation the authority? *Nobody.*

How are we to know what is the genuine written Word of God? The Vicar can give no intelligible answer, because he has no conception of the character and office of the Church of God. The Catholic at once gives an answer in the words of St. Augustine: "I should not believe the Gospel were I not

moved thereto by the authority of the Catholic Church." So must it be with every man who looks the question fairly in the face. The Bible is the creation of the Church; and to accept it, in any true sense,*as the Word of God, logically involves a belief in the infallibility of the Church. External authority is the only voucher for canonicity. It was for the Church here, as in doctrinal controversies, to judge of conflicting traditions and diverging opinions, and in the fullness of time to give her sentence. And, in fact, so she judged, and judged infallibly, or her judgment is vain. The Vicar, who hypocritically boasts of the "Bible-only" principle (thereby flatly contradicting his own school), prefers the opinion of the Quaker critic, Tregelles, to the authority of the Church of God. Well, that is consistent enough. In the first days of Protestantism private judgment fixed what the Scripture *meant*; now textual criticism settles for the Vicar what Scripture *says*; and shortly "higher criticism" will reject text and meaning alike. In Germany such criticism has put the Bible in the museum,—England will soon follow suit. But one thing is certain, that, as in the centuries before the birth of Protestantism, so after it is dead and gone, the Catholic Church will continue to read in her Bible and profess in her creed that "there are Three who give testimony in Heaven, and these Three are one"—the Vicar's Quaker critic and "scholarly revisors" to the contrary notwithstanding.

On leaving this irrelevant topic, I would call the attention of your learned readers to a very recent discussion, *pro* and *con*, between Catholic theologians. I refer to the articles by the Abbé Martin (recently deceased), the Abbé Rambouillet, and Canon Maunoury, in the *Revue des Sciences Ecclesiastiques*, Août et Septembre, 1887; Septembre, 1888; Mars, Avril, et Mai, 1889 (now before me); and to the *Dublin Review*, January, 1890, p. 182.

THIRD LETTER.—I beg the serious attention of your readers to my comments on this letter. I have convicted him of so many impudent falsehoods that I am loath to follow him further. But he has now so surpassed himself in shameless,

unblushing, and deliberate mendacity that I cannot pass it by. Here "Iniquity hath lied to itself," and I have alleged it to be *deliberate*. Let me probe it.

He says:

"Let us now consider . . . whether or not my opponent has yet accomplished the penance I set him for his impertinence to Bishop Kingdon.

"It will be remembered that I set him to name a manuscript of the Latin Vulgate, either uncial or cursive, which reads *Ipsum* instead of *Ipse* or *Ipsa* in Gen. iii. 15."

When he wrote this last paragraph, had he become too petrified for any moral struggle? In pity let us believe it. Doubtless his purpose, but took on the shape of Macbeth's thoughts when contemplating Duncan's murder:

Stars, hide your fires!
Let not light see my black and deep desires!
The eye wink at the hand! Yet let that be
Which the eye fears when it is done to see.

He asserts that he set me, as a penance, "to name a manuscript of the Latin Vulgate" which has *Ipsum*. Most wicked and deliberate falsehood! He never mentioned "a manuscript of the Latin Vulgate" from first to last. Here I am irresistibly reminded of these 'crushing words of Inspiration: "Out of thy own mouth I judge thee, thou wicked servant"; and, let me add the sentence, from the same source, in words equally fitting: "The feet of those who shall bury thee are at the door." Now to the proof.

In his very first letter in this controversy (the third preliminary letter in this volume), he wrote as follows:

(Mr. Quigley) "asks somewhat indignantly why Bishop Kingdon, in his lecture, did not put the real state of the question before his hearers, and tell them the dispute was not between *Ipse* and *Ipsa*, but also between *Ipsum*. *Where, then, is to be found a Latin Version of the Bible with IPSUM in this passage?*—(Gen. iii. 15). *I have never seen it in my commentary.*"

Again, in the eighth preliminary letter, when declining my challenge, he says:

"The matter is very simple. Mr. Quigley has impugned Bishop Kingdon's scholarship, and has emphasized, in the title of his letters (not *Ipse*, *Ipsa*, but *Ipse*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*), what he considers an important emendation. . . . I have, therefore, asked him in the first place to mention some of those standard *Latin Versions of the Bible* (mark you!) he accused the Bishop of overlooking."

And again, in the first letter of his first series of *Strictures*, he wrote :

"My challenge, therefore, to my opponent to name *even one old Latin Version of the Bible* (mark you!) containing *IPSUM* in Gen. iii. 15, was made simply to punish him for impugning the Bishop's scholarship and honesty."

Once more, in the second letter of the same series, he undertakes to examine :

"Whether my opponent has properly performed the penance I set him for his impertinence to Bishop Kingdon, that is to say, has he really adduced *any Latin Version of the Old Testament* (mark you!) of any critical value whatever in the eyes of Biblical scholars, to justify his assertion that Bishop Kingdon suppressed the truth when he omitted to mention *Ipsum* as a various reading in Gen. iii. 15."

Again, in the same letter he asks me

"To name a *Latin Version* (mark you!) either among the uncials or cursives which contains the word *Ipsum* in Gen. iii. 15."—

and he winds up by again proclaiming his ignorance in these words :

"In all the commentaries I have read on Gen. iii. 15, I have never found *Ipsum* mentioned as a *various reading* (mark you!) and that, therefore, I doubt if one exists."

These quotations give an absolutely correct and exhaustive account of his utterances on *Ipsum*. Where can your readers find a demand upon me "to name a manuscript of the Latin Vulgate"? And yet he has the audacious effrontery to say that "*It will be remembered*" he had set me that task as a "penance"! What shameless, deliberate mendacity! Truth and honesty have no claims upon him—he murders them in

cold blood. Does it abate the moral horror that must thrill your readers to parallel him with Macbeth when bracing himself for his great crime?

. . . . Why do I yield to that suggestion
Whose horrid image doth unfix my hair.
And make my seated heart knock at my ribs
Against the use of nature? Present fears
Are less than horrible imaginings:
My thought, whose murder yet is but fantastical,
Shakes so my single state of man, that function
Is smothered in surmise; *and nothing is*
But what is not.

"And nothing is but what is not." How happily these words express the essence of the Vicar's babblings in the letter I am now reviewing! He asserts the thing that is not, and then proceeds to build his "castles in the air."

Now, your readers will remember that the first branch of my position against Bishop Kingdon was, that the reading in Gen. iii. 15 was *various*, that is to say, not *Ipsa*, *Ipsa* simply, but *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*. The Vicar, as appears by the quotation made shortly ago, denied the existence of *Ipsum*, declared he had never seen it mentioned as a *various reading*, and challenged me to produce "*any Latin Version of the Bible*" having it. A reference to the fourth letter of my *Rejoinder* will show that I gave him SIX FAMOUS LATIN BIBLES, with a host of other great authorities. Thereupon, stupefied by his humiliated vanity, he blurts out the insolent untruth that he had asked me for "a manuscript of the Latin Vulgate."

Who ever claimed that *Ipsum* was found in the Latin Vulgate? Why, *Ipsa* is the great sin of that Version in the Vicar's eyes, and I put it forward as the authority, *par excellence*, for that one of the various readings which I had to prove. For the other *two*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*, I adduced names and books from every quarter, and I think I have satisfied your readers on that score. In a postscript to the fourth letter of my *Rejoinder* will be found additional evidence for *Ipsum*, which will allay the Vicar's thirst for "Uncials" and "Cursives."

In the same letter I have charged against the Vicar the das-

tardly crime of literary forgery—that is, garbling a quotation from De Rossi, which he gave in the ninth preliminary letter in this volume. Every one, Catholic and Protestant alike, to whom I showed the books, confessed it was an infamous trick. He copied from De Rossi *right up* to the word *Ipsum*, wilfully and wickedly suppressed it, interpolated words not in De Rossi's text at all, and then solemnly declared that :

“In all the commentaries I have read on Gen. iii. 15, I have never found *Ipsum* mentioned as a various reading, and that therefore I doubt if one exists.”

In his letter, now under review, he admits the commission of the forgery in these words :

“I allow that I purposely omitted mention of *Ipsum* in my summary of De Rossi, because had I introduced it without a long explanation (such as now given), after the utter rubbish written about *Ipsum* by my opponent, I should only have seconded his efforts to confuse the public mind, and I wanted to be spared the unnecessary and useless trouble of giving it.”

What a confession ! But the “damned spot” will not so “out.” Examine it as paralleled :

De Rossi's words.

“Which original authorities and witnesses being most exceedingly grave and insurmountable, evidently demonstrate that the true reading of the sacred text is *Hu, Ipse, Ipsum.*”

The Vicar's forgery.

“He (De Rossi) enumerates thirty-five ‘most exceedingly and insurmountable original authorities and witnesses’ in support of the masculine ‘*He* shall bruise the serpent's head.’”

Why suppress *Ipsum*, interpolate the Scripture text, “*He* shall bruise the serpent's head,” and then avow to his readers that—“I have never found *Ipsum* mentioned as a various reading”? What explanation was needed? Moreover, when the Vicar volunteered the evidence of De Rossi, I had not discussed *Ipsum* beyond my statement of fact in my first letter to the Bishop, and the Vicar himself had concluded that “the controversy had closed.” “I wanted to be spared the unnecessary and useless trouble of giving it,” he says. “*Ay,*

there's the rub." The hypocritical stickler for honesty now confesses that he considers it to be "unnecessary and useless" to abstain from literary forgeries—and therefore any other crime—if these can in any way be made "advantageous to our Church." This candid avowal explains his course in this discussion. The principle is borrowed from his master, Little-dale, whose whole career was shaped and directed by it. The disciple is worthy of the master in blatant dishonesty, though not in ability. May the occasion of the awful judgment of Holy Writ strike terror into his heart while he is still young: "The feet of those who shall bury thee are at the door."

I will now consider the Vicar's attempt at humor. He *pretends* to believe that I did not know there were but two genders in Hebrew, because I so effectively exposed his dishonest garbling of De Rossi. I have already discussed the matter in the last letter of my *Rejoinder*. But I will offer here my account of the language in the fourth letter of the *Rejoinder*, which he criticizes.

I despaired of making plain to the non-classical reader the Vicar's heinous forgery of De Rossi mentioned above. I set about it, however, in these words:

"Here let me clear the way for a full understanding of the position by the ordinary reader. In Hebrew the words corresponding to *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsa* are *Hu*, *Hi*, *Hu*, to speak popularly, since I cannot reproduce here the Hebrew characters. It will be noticed that in Hebrew the masculine and neuter genders are the same, so that an authority for one is at the same time an authority for the other."

Now, in adopting this mode of speech my sole desire was to aid the ordinary reader in comprehending the matter in dispute. I therefore paralleled the Hebrew—*Hu*, *Hi*, *Hu*, with the Latin *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*; that is to say, I made use of *physical signs* rather than strict *grammatical forms*, for the purpose of impressing the idea more sharply on the mind of the general reader. *Hu*, as a sign, is represented in Latin by *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, and *Hi*, also as a sign, is represented in Latin by *Ipsa*—at least in the matter and connection under discussion in this controversy. Had I pointed out that *Hi* sometimes

represented the neuter gender (viz., *when it refers to inanimate objects*), I would have only blurred the clear impression which the parallelism I had made was well calculated to give. No such explanation was necessary here, because we were not discussing “inanimate objects,” but no less a *person* than the Immaculate Mother of God. Therefore I confined *Hi* to the expression of the feminine gender. For this reason, I submit to your learned readers that my parallel is not only legitimate, but well conceived in this connection. Indeed, it was suggested to me by all the Latin commentators on our text. For instance, many of them say that the Hebrew MSS. have *Ipsum*, while others say they have *Ipse*,—*Hu*, the Hebrew sign, being the equivalent for both. This explains, very clearly, what I meant when I said that an authority, in Hebrew, for the masculine *Ipse*, is at the same time an authority for the neuter, *Ipsum*. De Rossi supports and confirms my whole position here, for he says: “The true reading of the sacred text is *Hu*, *Ipse*, *Ipsum*: and countless Catholic authors, both before and since the Council of Trent, follow this reading as the truer, and prefer it to the feminine”; that is, prefer it to *Hi*—*Ipsa*. Your readers will instantly remark that De Rossi adopts absolutely my parallel, *Hu*, *Hi*, *Hu*—*Ipse*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*; and he does not confuse his readers by reminding them that “inanimate objects,” of which he was not speaking, are sometimes masculine, and sometimes feminine in Hebrew. I very much fear the poor Vicar will never recover his mental equilibrium. That “six weeks” study of the Fathers has proved too much for him.

Here I close my comments on his third letter. Your readers will not now be deceived by the shameless falsehood, repeated over and over again, that he had set me to name “a manuscript of the Latin Vulgate which reads *Ipsum*.”

FOURTH LETTER.—Beyond the untruth just now exposed, and which “like a wounded snake, drags its slow length along,” this contains nothing worthy of remark. He simply repeats from his first series of *Strictures* what I have fully answered in my *Rejoinder*. There is, however, an insult to myself

against which I must protest. He represents me speaking of him as—"Father!" O, No! God forbid that I should so dishonor a title consecrated by respect and affection to the Catholic Priesthood. It is a piece of wanton insolence to put it into my mouth as applied to him.

FIFTH LETTER.—If it be true that "all a man's experience is *funded* in him," the Vicar is to be envied. He has prated *ad nauseam* about "forgeries," "verifications" of authorities, and my "Seminary text-books." We have long since learned how ridiculous were his pretensions in this particular. But I propose now to expose another infamous trick, as bad if not worse than any we have had from "the cap and bells."

He returns, in this letter, to the discussion of *Ipsa*. Early in this controversy, with characteristically vulgar insolence, he charged that I had the help of "learned friends." Now he declares the source from which *he* has drawn *his* information. It is from the office of the London *Church Times*,—Littledale's workshop. "The *Church Times*," he says, "courteously allowed one of the students on its staff to make references for me to these works." I have no doubt this "student" was Littledale—the "grinning Voltaire" of the Ritualistic party. One of the "works" reported by the "student"—"the scholar who made the references for me," says the Vicar, —was the "famous work" of Father Vercellone on the "Various Readings of the Latin Vulgate Bible," in two folio volumes, Rome, 1860. I got it since writing my *Rejoinder*, and it is now before me. Now watch the trick of the "scholar" and his dupe and accomplice, the pseudo—"Priest of the Mission Church."

Vercellone—"the eminent Roman Catholic scholar," as the Vicar truly calls his new-found *aide*—is commenting (Vol. 1, p. 11), on Gen. iii. 15. He refers to the essays of De Rossi and Cardinal Patrizi, which I have so fully reported to your readers. He then says (I translate):

"From which it appears to be established (*videtur constare*), that at first the present reading of the Vulgate arose from carelessness of the copyists, and was then preserved by the Roman revisors of the

text because it had secured for itself a kind of prescriptive right from the usage of many centuries among the Latins in nearly all the MSS.: *so that it was evidently a far greater INCONVENIENCE to change it than to leave it untouched.*"

In these words Vercellone simply sums up the opinions of De Rossi and Patrizi. But surely there is nothing new here. Was not the learned Cardinal one of my own witnesses against *Ipsa*, and in support of *Ipse*, *Ipsum*? And did I not impale the Vicar for his wickedness (now confessed!) in suppressing *Ipsum* from De Rossi's text?

The Vicar gives the first clause in the above quotation from Vercellone; but who suppressed the second clause which I have italicized? Was it the "scholar" of the *Church Times* on his unprincipled henchman here? If it was Littledale, then the disciple is so worthy of the master that they can divide the glory of the infamy between them; but if it was the Vicar, ~~then the master can still rejoice in being "beaten by the boy" at his own game.~~

But why did they suppress the last clause? "Ay, there's the rub." It was to help Bishop Kingdon in his preposterous, disgraceful, and dishonoring statement—which he has not yet retracted and apologized for—that the Immaculate Conception was founded on *Ipsa*. What satanic persistence in calumny! "Evil be thou my good!" is evidently their motto in regard to the Catholic Church. Now mark, my readers. In my very first letter I said:

"The simple truth is that (Bishop Kingdon's) theory of a misprint and his statement there anent is sheer nonsense. There is absolutely no difference *in sense*, to the Catholic mind at least, between the three readings (*Ipse*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*). . . . It becomes a mere quillet of verbal criticism. . . . I, as a Catholic, have no more interest in retaining "IPSA," "SHE" in the text than he has so far as the Immaculate Conception is concerned."

This is the language alike of the great Catholic scholars who adopt *Ipse*, *Ipsum*, on critical grounds, as of those who plead for *Ipsa* on the same grounds. In proof of this I have given some of the most profound theologians in the Church,—*not one of whom has been, or can be, offset by contrary teaching.*

And all this is now absolutely confirmed by the evidence of the learned Vercellone, a witness "courteously" called to the Vicar's assistance by the "scholar" of the *Church Times*. What a cruel Nemesis! What a crushing humiliation to Bishop Kingdon! The Vicar says that Vercellone is "an eminent Roman Catholic scholar." Precisely. He ought therefore to be accepted by Protestants as a better authority on Catholic doctrine than Bishop Kingdon? Most assuredly. Well, then, Vercellone says that, assuming the critical aspect of the matter to be as stated by De Rossi and Patrizi, still from its great antiquity and almost universal use in the Western Church, it would cause greater INCONVENIENCE if *Ipsa* were changed to *Ipsa* or *Ipsum* than if it were left untouched. Simply "inconvenient," mark you. Is this the language of a Catholic Theologian when he is discussing a question in which Christian doctrine is involved? O, no; but it is the reason why the Vicar found it *convenient* to suppress this part of the quotation from Vercellone, that is, if the second-hand "reference" of his "scholar" contained it. Of course, "you know," honesty is quite "unnecessary and useless" in dealing with a "Roman controversialist." It is "beneath the dignity of a gentleman to cross swords" in *honorable* warfare with "such an adversary"; and then, "you know," if he happens to be one of the "poor Irish," one stands in grave danger of hearing from the "Shillalah," "you know."

But more. Vercellone proceeds to discuss the whole question, and he gives the authorities for *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*, though not so much in detail as I have given them. He expresses his own opinion that "there are many arguments which render *Ipsa* (or *Ipsum*) the more probable," but he commends the Papal Revisors for retaining *Ipsa* and he gives very logical reasons. Here, however, is the cap-sheaf of the evidence of this "eminent Roman Catholic scholar" (I translate):

"But as regards the sense, it must be observed that both readings have the same meaning; for whether you say *He* (the Son of the woman) shall crush the serpent's head, or *She* (the Woman by her Son) shall crush the serpent's head, the same doctrine (or idea) is expressed."

What will Bishop Kingdon say to this? Why did not the Vicar's "scholar" report it? What infamous deceit has this "Old Catholic" jackanapes, this Ritualistic Thersites practiced upon the public! In his fourth letter, speaking of my argument, he wrote:

"Surely if his first contention be true, that it makes absolutely no difference to the meaning of Gen. iii. 15, whatever the gender of the pronoun, then, for him at all events, *Cadit questio*."

"*Cadit questio*"—the discussion is at an end. Precisely! And may I humbly presume to think that he will be satisfied with the testimony of his own witness, the "eminent Roman Catholic scholar," so "courteously" recommended to him by his "student," counsellor, and guide of the *Church Times*—the sponsor, confessedly, of many of his monstrosities? Face to face with this witness I ask the Vicar to pause. At the close of his first series of *Strictures* he bade me remember that:

"Giants of learning who have prostituted their talents 'to make void the Word of God by mere human tradition,' and so to deceive numberless souls dear to God's heart, will appear exceedingly 'liliputian,' if nothing worse, at the Great Assize."

I quite agree. It is the only truth he has uttered since this controversy began. "Liliput" indeed he is, even when *primed* by his "learned friends" in the "good old country," and he is also something worse. But let him recall, while there is time for repentance, that God has declared that "he who speaketh less shall not escape." There will be no "scholars" of the Littledale stripe to act as counsel for convicted liars at the "Great Assize," but every soul bloated with falsehood and calumny, and scarred by infamies such as he has committed during this discussion, shall be put to "the penal discipline that looks to health" should it have the good fortune, by God's uncovenanted mercy, to escape the merciless fate of Bellarmine and Baronius consigned by him to "the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone."

Again. In his first *Strictures*, the Vicar had alleged the

"awful consequences" of the so-called "misprint" to be "an undue exaltation of the Holy Virgin." To meet this absurdity I changed the venue (in the fifth and sixth letters of my *Rejoinder*), from the Latin Church where *Ipsa* was used, to the Greek or Oriental Church where *Autos—Ipse* prevailed. We found that the Greek Fathers simply exhausted the glowing splendors of their magnificent tongue on panegyricizing the Blessed Mother. This my opponent calls "the most contemptible of shifts." Indeed! Well, let me reassure him that notwithstanding their language, the same Fathers held as the Catholic Church holds to-day—that Christ, the Seed of the woman, is the Champion of the human race against the Devil and all his aides and abettors. But hear Balaam's ass once more. The Vicar writes:

"The consent of the Fathers of the first six centuries (*he might have said of nineteen centuries almost*) is therefore unanimous as to the *meaning*, if not as to the *reading*, of Gen. iii. 15. Not one attributes the bruising of the serpent's head to the Blessed Virgin but to Christ immediately and alone."

Precisely. This is what Vercellone, his own witness has told him, what the Bull *Ineffabilis* says, what the Catholic Church teaches, and what I have tried to get into his malevolently ignorant head from the beginning. Christ, our blessed Lord and Saviour, crushes the serpent's head by the prowess of His own Divinity and Almighty power, and Mary, as one of the redeemed, the first in glory among the redeemed, is said to crush the serpent's head by giving birth to Jesus, and in, by, and through that grace and virtue with which she was endued by Him. The Doctors of the Church are just as unanimous in this teaching in the Nineteenth Century as were the Fathers of the first six centuries. Can the Vicar be sincere in his insolent attempt to ignore this explanation of the meaning of *Ipsa*? Or, has the unclean spirit of malice and calumny so wholly possessed him that he cannot see it?

Once more. Your readers will remember, that when I quoted against him the crushing evidence of Prudentius, the Vicar cried out "spurious!" But he asked permission to consult his "learned friends" in England. I assured your

readers that he could get no support for his cowardly statement from his English "scholars" or elsewhere. I was correct again. His friends, while they blush for his audacious ignorance, assure him that my quotation from Prudentius "is genuine," and once more this wretched pilferer of scraps, and retailer of exploded calumnies, "bites the dust."

And finally. Your readers will remember, that in the fifth letter of his first *Strictures* the Vicar said :

"I am *credibly informed* that no instance is to be found in any Ecclesiastical writer (mark you!) of even the corrupt reading *Ipsa* being interpreted of the Blessed Virgin till St. Bernard's time (12th Century)."

"Credibly informed," forsooth! He has confessedly been but a wind-bag and foot-ball for every so-called "scholar" to whom he appealed for help. His repeated confession of his reliance on "learned friends" explains his contemptible cowardice in refusing to meet me on the public platform. On more than one occasion, he taunted me with receiving assistance from distinguished Catholic scholars. This provoked some amusement among your readers who recalled my challenge to him and Bishop Kingdon. His miserable insinuation but witnessed to the low vulgarity and baseness of the poltroon, with whom it is my misfortune to deal. He hoped thereby to screen himself from the scorn and contempt of fair-minded Protestants in this community, but he has—failed.

Now, I accepted the gauntlet thrown down by the Vicar's informer. In the twenty-eighth letter of my *Rejoinder* I produced *eleven* "Ecclesiastical writers" (and I offered to produce twenty-eight), who interpret *Ipsa* of the Blessed Virgin before St. Bernard's time. What did he say to this? Here are his words:

"Notice *in the first place* that my opponent dares not call them Fathers, because he knows that but few, if any, of them rank with what his own Church technically style 'the Fathers.'"

That is to say, he asked me for "Ecclesiastical writers" and now howls because he gets them. He reminds me of the little boy who cried bitterly because he could not eat all the

pudding his mother gave him. Well, St. Ephrem is not only a "Father" of the Church but a Doctor as well; St. John Damascene is called the last of the Greek Fathers, while even Prudentius is reckoned a "Father" by the learned Protestant Le Clerc in his "Primitive Fathers," p. 281, and Erasmus declares that he deserves to be ranked among the gravest Doctors of the Church. St. Proclus was an illustrious Father of the Church, St. Tarasius a Patriarch of Constantinople, and Chrysippus a Presbyter of Jerusalem. I did not quote from these three, but I mentioned them as authorities for the use of *Ipsa*, or the idea expressed by it, before St. Bernard's time. I have their words before me in Greek and Latin,—produceable on demand of Bishop Kingdon.

Again he says:

(Notice) "*in the second (place)*, that he does not inform us how many of the twenty-eight belong to the first six centuries, which are all I ask for, though in an *obiter dictum* I said something about St. Bernard."

Ha! Ha!! Ha!!! "Obiter dictum," indeed! How complimentary to the "scholar" (this time Bishop Kingdon perhaps), who so badly fooled him! "Something about St. Bernard!" He pretends to have forgotten all about it though he assured your readers that he was "credibly informed" it was true. Ye Gods and little fishes!

Again he writes:

(Notice) "*in the third (place)*, that he does not say how many came after St. Bernard's time (12th Century)."

Of course I don't! He confined me to that time—else I could fill a column. But note the malicious pretence that I had gone outside his limits. The *twenty-eight* writers of whom I spoke (and to which I can now add), are all BEFORE St. Bernard's time,—and I emphatically so declared. I gave the names of eleven of these writers, with quotations from some only, to economize space. They are all what he demanded—"Ecclesiastical writers"; three of them, at least, are illustrious "Fathers," and eight of them are within the first six centuries. Yet he mendaciously asserts, that I gave *two* ex-

tracts from writers later than St. Bernard! I beg your readers to verify my statement by a reference to the end of the twenty-eighth letter of my *Rejoinder*. I gave *one* extract from the celebrated Lipsius, but I said it was not to count against the Vicar, "since Lipsius lived long after St. Bernard."

This unfortunate man has more than once assured us, on the authority of "God's holy Word, the Word of Truth," that "all liars shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." He has given many proofs that he is willing to risk it.

SIXTH LETTER.—Here the Vicar quotes very beautiful words from St. Ephrem, with every one of which I most heartily agree. They but express, in the Saint's magnificent way, the glory of Christ's triumph over Satan, and our redemption by His Cross and Passion. The result of this victory was to be what St. Paul declared to the Romans: "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet speedily." St. Ephrem knew very well, that among all the redeemed of Christ, His blessed Mother supereminently illustrated in her life this result. Therefore he addresses her in words already given: "Hail Paradise of delights . . . Hail, thou pure one who crushed the head of the most wicked dragon and hurled him bound in chains into the abyss." The Vicar, with perverse stupidity, alleges that *his* quotations prove *mine* to be "spurious." May God forgive him! He also complained that I gave no reference. It does not make much difference to him, but here it is: (I translate)—"Prayer to the Mother of God, Greek Translation E.—F., p. 547, Latin Translation, Vol. 3." The Greek and Latin are before me. Let me add to St. Ephrem's prayer a very good commentary upon it.

In *Hymn* 27, the Saint writes:

"Truly it is Thou and Thy Mother only who are fair altogether. For in Thee there is no stain, and in Thy Mother no spot. But my sons (*i.e.*, the members of the Church of Edessa) are far from resembling this twofold fairness." And again: "Two were made simple, innocent, perfectly like each other—Mary and Eve—but afterwards one became the cause of our death, the other of our life" (u. 327a).

The "scholars" who supply this Ritualistic wind-bag with references and scraps, will find the above quotations in Bickell's critical edition of the *Hymns* of St. Ephrem, p. 122.

When the Vicar has again "six weeks" to devote to the Fathers, let me commend to him the magnificent edition of the *Hymns and Sermons* of St. Ephrem, in Syriac and Latin, recently completed by the learned Professor Lamy, of Louvain University, in 3 vols., 4to.

He closes the letter under consideration with a telling illustration from St. Liguori, of the intercession of the Blessed Mother with her Divine Son. I have already so fully explained and vindicated the principles of intercessory prayer (see *Rejoinder*, 23d letter), that I need not remark upon it here. His tiresome jumbling of subjects will, however, necessitate a word later on.

SEVENTH LETTER.—My remarks on this will be very brief. At the close of his first *Strictures* he started an objection, in *twenty lines*, to the Catholic view of the Blessed Virgin's position based on the alleged silence of Scripture. This he did to draw me off from a logical treatment of the matter in hand. Now, I have given some years to the study of Euclid; I have also spent some years in walks amid the majestic towers and under the sweeping arches, in the sun-lit glades and over the prairie amphitheatres of Catholic thought, and it is simple fact to say, that the logic of the former is not more irrefragable than that of the latter—as *the* intellectual system of Christianity. Therefore the Vicar's attempt to draw me in his direction did not succeed. But I offered to discuss in the Anglican pulpits this text: "Mary, the Mother of Jesus, in Prophecy and its Fulfilment interpreted by Antiquity,"—in other words, *Mary in the Gospels*; or, if that did not suit my opponents, I challenged Bishop Kingdon to lead out a dozen of his Oxford "scholars" to discuss it before any audience. The gauntlet thus fairly thrown down remains untouched, and I do not propose at this stage to take up a new line of argument. I do reassert, however, that no mathematical proposition is more rigorously demonstrable than is the

direct contradictory of the Protestant position on this matter. When Oxford, led by Bishop Kingdon, can muster courage to meet me I will be on hand.

EIGHTH LETTER.—His remarks here on the authenticity of the “Acts of the Martyrdom of St. Andrew,” I had already anticipated by a frank and honest statement of the authorities. I will now add, however, that the counter-arguments of Cave are founded on a falsification of facts.

He perverts, though, and misrepresents the object of my quoting this document. I was not discussing the Immaculate Conception when I quoted the words alleged to be St. Andrew’s: (Our Lord) “was born of a blameless Virgin.” As your honest readers will confess, I was then engaged in setting before them the picture of Mary as the Greek Fathers *alone* have painted her from the very dawn of Christianity,—and in regions where *Ipsa* was unknown.

Now, however, that his dishonesty, ignorance, and stupidity has put me to it, and all the authorities are in my hand, I had better pulverize him.

In the first place, then, let me call attention to the Vicar’s utter incapacity to understand the matters he has dared to handle. He refers your readers to page xvi. of the Introduction to Volume XVI. of Clarke’s Ante-Nicene Library, now before me. Let us examine its contents.

The “Introduction” is made up of critical notices of documents of which a translation is given in the volume. Among these notices is one of a book entitled—*Acts of Andrew*. A short history of the disputed authorship is then given. Immediately thereupon the editors say:

“This *book* (the *Acts of Andrew*) is *much the same* in substance with the celebrated *Presbyterorum et Diaconorum Achaiae de Martyrio S. Andreae Apostoli epistola encyclica*—(Encyclical Letter of the Priests and Deacons of Achaia concerning the Martyrdom of St. Andrew the Apostle).”

Now, I am not concerned here with the extent of their difference. I have nothing to do with the “book” as such. In the fifth letter of my *Rejoinder* I professed to quote from

"*the celebrated letter*," and I am obligated to your readers only to prove the credibility of the witness whose testimony I offered to them. I hope the Vicar will admit that *this* is a lawyer-like view of my duty, since he has assured us that "there are lawyers and lawyers."

Well, then, this "celebrated letter" was at first considered spurious, or at least doubtful, because it was in Latin, and no Greek copy known; but since the Greek was found in the Bodleian Library, Oxford University, and published by Charles Christian Woog, a learned Protestant, in 1749, all intelligent doubt has ceased, so that Morcelli, the famous Jesuit archæologist and epigraphist, made no difficulty about inserting it as true and authentic in his *Calendar of the Church of Constantinople*, under the date of the 30th November. Woog himself held it to be a genuine writing of the Apostolic age, composed about A.D. 80, and he has most ably vindicated it against all its assailants. What great scholars support him? Morcelli, Cardinals Baronius and Bellarmine, Gallandus, Plazza, Natalis Alexander, and Lamper. Who oppose him? Fabricius, who only thinks it later than the Apostolic age, and the Anglican scholar, Cave; but the latter is ruled out as an authority, because his counter-arguments are based upon a falsification of facts. The editors of Clarke's Library mention Thilo, but it is not very clear what his opinion is. Pusey admits that "it would, if genuine, have the same authority as Holy Scripture," and he does not even attempt to dispute it. They *all*, however, agree to assign the "celebrated letter" a place among the earliest records of the Church. This was all I claimed for it originally, though now your readers will concede, if evidence is worth anything, that the lips of my witness keep Apostolic testimony.

Again: The editors of Clarke's Library, speaking of the "book," say that—

"There does not seem to be any undoubted quotation of it before the eighth and the tenth centuries."

I am not concerned to dispute this statement with regard to the "book" as such, but it is utterly untrue as to the "letter"; for from *it* is taken the Preface of the Mass in the Gothic

Missal of the Sixth Century. My authority here is absolute and final, a "cloud of witnesses" in himself—Mabillon, *Liturgia Gallica*, L. 3, n. 17, p. 221.

I submit, therefore, to the jury of your readers that as well the competency as the credibility of my witness is unimpeachable. But I will now go farther. I will do what, keeping good faith with your readers, I did not do before; that is, I will quote the "celebrated letter" as evidence of the belief in the Immaculate Conception in Apostolic times. I give the Latin, with an English translation, as follows:

"Et quoniam de *immaculata* terra factus fuerat homo primus, qui per ligni prevaricationem mundo mortem intulerat: necessarium fuit, ut de *immaculata* Virgine nasceretur perfectus homo Filius Dei, vitam aeternam, quam per Adamum perdiderant homines, repararet, ac per lignum Crucis lignum concupiscentiae excluderet—And since the first man, who brought death into the world through the tree of prevarication, had been made from the immaculate (spotless, blameless) earth, it was necessary that the Son of God should be begotten a perfect man from an immaculate (spotless, blameless) Virgin, that He might restore that eternal life which men had lost through Adam, and cut off the tree of carnal desire by the tree of the Cross."

This comparison of the virgin earth with the immaculate Virgin shows us Mary immaculate in her very origin, even as was the earth of which the first man was formed, before God said to Adam: "Cursed is the earth in thy work." Moreover, this celebrated comparison became a common expression with the Fathers. Take, for instance, St. Hippolytus, Bishop and Martyr, early in the third century. Speaking first of our Lord, he says:

"He was the Ark formed of incorruptible wood. For by this is signified that *His tabernacle was exempt from putridity and corruption*, which brought forth no corruption or sin. But the Lord was exempt from sin, *of wood not obnoxious to corruption according to man*; that is, of the Virgin and of the Holy Ghost, covered within and without with the pure gold of the Word of God." The same comparison is instituted between

Eve, while yet immaculate and incorrupt, that is to say, not subject to original sin, and the Blessed Virgin, by Saints Justin and Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Epiphanius. I refer your readers to the fifth and sixth letters of my *Rejoinder*, where I have quoted from all these Fathers in a different connection.

I address myself now to his remarks on the Liturgies. Here I beg an attentive and interested hearing. In the fifth letter of my *Rejoinder* I quoted from the Liturgy of St. James. Again I very properly referred to its evidential value. I do not remark upon the silly comments he makes about this Liturgy—they are beneath notice. What I want to consider is his pestilent assertion that the Eastern churches were accustomed to pray for the repose of the soul of OUR BLESSED LADY. In proof of this he says :

“To take as an example the Cultus of the Virgin with which we are now dealing. An eighth century manuscript of St. Chrysostom’s Liturgy mentions the Blessed Virgin only twice, once to *pray for her* (italics his) in common with the rest of the faithful departed in Paradise.”

This astounding statement I assure your readers is a r and unblushing falsehood. What it lacks in malice up by criminal ignorance. Please follow me patiently, my readers, while I expose the manner in which this unscrupulous “sacerdotal pretender” has turned a holy thing to his vile uses. As has been my rule, the authorities I follow are the *great* authorities—Renaudot, Asseman, Cardinal Bona, Goar, and Leo Allatius. It will be remembered that the Rev. G. Williams, King’s College, Cambridge, assured Pusey that, “We cannot have a more competent witness than Leo Allatius,” on the Greek Office Books. Let, then, these scholars lead us through the Eastern Liturgies.

I will first consider the Liturgy of St. Mark, the Liturgy of the Church of Alexandria. I extract from that part of it known to Catholics as the Canon—the most sacred part of the Mass—what is called a commemoration.

“*To the souls of our fathers and brethren who aforetime have kept in the faith of Christ, give rest O Lord our God ; being mind-*

ful of our forefathers from the beginning, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, saints, and just men, and of every spirit that hath been perfected in the faith of Christ, and of those of whom *we make commemoration this day*, and of our holy father, Mark, Apostle and Evangelist, who showed us the way of salvation. [Here is said the Hail Mary.] Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, because thou hast brought forth the Saviour of our souls. [Then the priest proceeds, raising his voice] and (be mindful) *especially of our all holy, unspotted, and blessed Lady the Mother of God, the ever Virgin Mary*" (Renaudot: *Liturgiæ Orientales*, vol. i., pp. 149, 150).

Who but the Vicar and "his kidney," can be such a blundering ignoramus as not to see the difference between praying for mercy *upon* the souls of the faithful departed, and praying *by* the hallowed memory of the saints? Is he so blind as not to be able to read the "Hail Mary" when it is set before his eyes in clear, bold type? What did the Psalmist mean when he said, "O Lord! remember David and all his meekness"? The above extract contains the first portion of the "Hail Mary," sufficient evidence, if there were no other, of the absurdity of the Vicar's assertion. But some "scholar" from the "good old country"—from the *Church Times* factory—will perhaps "credibly inform" him that the "Hail Mary" is a manifest interpolation. Well, what then? Such a plea is entirely beside the mark, as your readers will admit. Granted, for the sake of argument, that the "Hail Mary" found no place in the earliest form of the Liturgy, what manner of prayer must that have been in which this invocation could be inserted? What man out of Bedlam (or its equivalent, High,—Low,—Broad,—No,—Church Anglicanism) could imagine the Alexandrian Christians to have interrupted by *such an interpolation* a prayer for the repose of our Lady's soul? The simple fact (so plain to a Catholic) is, that the Mother of God is *commemorated*, not, of course, *prayed for*.

But perhaps Bishop Kingdon, who knew so much about the "tremendous importance" of *Ipsa*, will instruct his Vicar (if he has not soured on him because of that *obiter dictum* about St. Bernard), that the Alexandrian Christians, when they said, "be

mindful of the saints," must have intended to pray for them! The gudgeons of the "Mission Church" may be caught with bait like this. I may then ask once more, what the Psalmist meant when he said, "O Lord! remember David and all his meekness"? Fortunately, however, I can pin down these shufflers—the Oxford twain—with something more pointed than a mere *a pari* argument.

I will now give a passage from the Coptic Liturgy of St. Cyril, which is only another recension of that called after St. Mark. The following prayer occupies in St. Cyril's Liturgy exactly the same place as that which I quoted from "St. Mark":

"Grant rest to our fathers and brethren who have slept, and whose souls Thou hast received. Be mindful also of all the saints who from the beginning have been pleasing to Thee, our holy fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, preachers, and all the spirits of the just who have been perfected in the faith. But especially of the holy and most glorious Mother of God, ever Virgin, the pure and stainless Saint Mary . . . and of the whole choir of Thy saints.

(The Priest): And we, O Lord, are not worthy to make supplication for those blessed ones; but whereas they stand before the throne of Thy only begotten Son. *May they intercede in our place for our poverty and weakness.* Forgive us our transgressions for the sake of their prayers in our behalf, and for the sake of Thy blessed name which is invoked upon us" (Renaudot: Lit. Orient., i., pp. 41, 42).

From the same authority I can match this extract with parallel passages from the Coptic Liturgies or Anaphoræ of St. Gregory and St. Basil the Great. The latter, with that of St. Chrysostom, holds undisturbed sway in the East to-day, among Catholics and schismatics alike.

Now, your readers will easily see that to "*commemorate*" a saint implies that—in the words of St. Cyril's Liturgy—he "stands before the throne" of God in eternal blessedness making intercession for us; but to "*pray for*" a person implies that he is in some place or state in which our intercession can benefit him.

But St. Cyril (of Jerusalem) goes further and explains that the practice of the Church was to commemorate *not only*

Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, etc., *but also* to pray for all other departed souls, and he tells us the reason WHY they commemorated one class and prayed for the other. "We commemorate," he says, "those who have fallen asleep before us, FIRST, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, *that God, by their prayers and intercession, would receive our petition*: then, ALSO, on behalf of the holy Fathers and Bishops who have fallen asleep before us, *and of all*, in short, who have already fallen asleep amongst us, *believing this to be a very great help to those souls*, for which the prayer is offered up, while the holy and most tremendous Victim lies present" (Catech. 23, Myst. 5, n. 10).

From these words of St. Cyril it is very clear that prayers were offered to God not *for* Patriarchs and Prophets, etc., but for those souls who had departed this life in sin, that God might be propitiated in their behalf and grant a respite to their punishment. The same explanation is given by St. Epiphanius, who says :

"For we make a commemoration of the just and on behalf of sinners; on behalf of sinners, supplicating mercy from God; and for the just, both Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles . . . in order that on account of the honor which we pay to Christ, we may separate him from the race of men" (*Haeres.* 75, n. 8).

St. John Chrysostom expresses himself in the same manner :

"Let us not then grow weary of helping the departed, of offering up prayers for them, for even the common expiation of the world lies (before us). By this made confident, we then pray for the world and name them *with* martyrs, with confessors, with priests. Yea, for one body are we all, although some members are more glorious than others. And it is possible *to gather* from all sides *pardon* for them from the prayers—from the gifts (offered) in their behalf—from *those who are named with them*" (Hom. lxi. on I. Cor., n. 5).

Having thus made clear to your Protestant readers, the distinction between *commemorating* a saint and *praying for* a person, I will return to the Liturgy of St. James—the Jerusalem Rite, from which are derived forty Syro-Jacobite Liturgies or Offices, as well as that of St. Chrysostom to be next

discussed. We find in this Liturgy (St. James'), in the Commemoration at Mass, these words :

"Let us commemorate our All-holy, Immaculate, most glorious and blessed Lady, the ever-Virgin MOTHER OF GOD and all the saints, that by their prayers and intercessions we may all obtain mercy" (Asseman, t. v., p. 24).

And this is followed (pp. 44, 45) by a singularly devout and affectionate prayer to her whom "all creatures congratulate," to her who is "ever blessed, every way blameless, more honorable than the Cherubim, more glorious than the Seraphim, . . . the hallowed temple, the spiritual paradise (of God), and glory of Virgins."

Again, in the *Syrian Rite*, in the Commemoration at Mass, we read :

"*Priest.* Especially and first of all, we make mention of the Holy, Glorious, and Ever-Virgin Mary, etc. *Deacon.* Remember her, Lord God, and at her holy and pure prayers be propitious, have mercy upon us, and favorably hear our prayers. *Priest.* Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, pray for me to thy Son, Only-begotten, Who came of thee, that, having remitted my sins and debts, He may accept from my humble and sinful hands this sacrifice, which is offered by my vileness upon this altar, through thy intercession, Mother most holy" (Asseman, t. v., p. 186).

I come now to the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. I have said that it was derived from that of St. James. My authorities say that this Liturgy, with that of St. Basil the Great, already referred to, holds undisputed sway in the East to-day. They are now such as they were when they came from the hands of the great men whose names they bear, and they are used by Catholics and Schismatics alike. They are used by the Russian Church in the Empire of Russia itself and throughout all the imperial dominions; not, indeed, in their Greek form but in the Slavonic, which is the liturgical language in all those parts. They are used in the Kingdom of Greece and its dependencies, and have universal sway among the Mingrelians, Wallachians, Ruthenians, Rascians, Bulgarians, and Albanians, as well as with all the Uniat or Melchite Greeks of the four Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and

Jerusalem. The United Greeks of Italy and those of the Austrian Empire also use them. St. Basil's Liturgy, we have seen, holds the same language as that of St. Cyril given above. Now, the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, by Goar, p. 78 (Paris, 1647), contains the same sort of commemoration with the meaning so clearly given by St. Cyril.

But, perhaps, some tricky "student" or "scholar" has told the Vicar of a well-known passage from "an eighth century manuscript of St. Chrysostom's Liturgy," in which the Holy Sacrifice is said to be offered "on behalf of" (the Greek preposition *Huper*), that is to say, *in honor of* the Saints and our Blessed Lady. Well, in the Mass to-day, according to the Rite of St. Chrysostom, we find the Offertory made :

"*In honor and memory of our singularly blessed and glorious Queen, Mary Theotokos and Ever-Virgin ; at whose intercession, O Lord, receive, O Lord, this Sacrifice unto Thy altar which is beyond the Heavens*" (Goar, *Euchologium Græcorum*, p. 58).

Now, granting for argument's sake, that the passage in question is of doubtful interpretation whatever may be the precise force of the Greek preposition *Huper*, which I have translated by the words "*on behalf of*," will Bishop Kingdon, laying aside for a moment *Ipsa* and its "awful consequences"—will he, I ask, dare—in the face of the absolute unanimity of the conservative Eastern Church, Catholic, Schismatic, Jacobite, and Nestorian against the Vicar's miserable second-hand falsehood,—will he, I again repeat, dare to put his Episcopal *imprimatur* on the proposition that the Greek preposition *Huper* will bear the meaning of the English preposition "*for*," in the phrase "*to pray for*" a person ?

It makes a serious man to burn with indignation ! One day they juggle with a Latin *pronoun*, another with a Greek *preposition*. In the latter case as in the former I give them their choice of acknowledging—either that they have perpetrated an egregious and unpardonable blunder, or that they have told an impudent falsehood.

When a gentleman finds that he has unwittingly cast a slur upon the hitherto stainless memory of another man's wife or

sister, he hastens to make a candid retraction and an humble apology. My opponents appear to think that the memory of the VIRGIN MOTHER OF GOD is entitled to less consideration (perhaps they imagine it is less affectionately cherished) than that of the mother or sister of the humblest of us all. For in *her* case they have substituted a repetition of the offence for the usual apology and retraction. I leave their punishment in the hands of your fair-minded readers.

A parting word on the Greek Liturgies. The Vicar, with his usual stupidity, writes :

“The fact is, the Liturgies, more than any other Church documents, have been subjected to alterations, excisions, and additions from time to time in the days of the manuscripts. A comparison of existing manuscripts tells us this.”

Well, what then? Let the learned Renaudot answer :

“Their (the Liturgies) weight does not depend on the authority of the writers, but on the *use of the Churches*. Those prayers had their authors, who indeed were not known; but, when once it was clear that they had been used in Mass, who their authors were ceased to be a question” (*Liturgiae Orient.*, vol. I., p. 173).

“The existing manuscripts,” says Cardinal Newman, “can hardly be supposed to be mere compositions, but are records of Rites.”

I commend to Anglicans who speak so pathetically of the Branch Theory—that mere “Will-o’-the-Wisp”—the following remark of the Cardinal :

“That usage, which, after a split has taken place in a religious communion, is found to obtain equally in each of its separated parts, may fairly be said to have existed before the split occurred. The concurrence of Orthodox, Nestorian, and Jacobite in the honors they pay to the Blessed Virgin, is an evidence that those honors were in their substance paid to her in their ‘Undivided Church.’”

The Vicar promises “to return to the Liturgies later on”; but wiser counsels prevailed, for he declares in his closing letter :

“I regret, exceedingly, as I have said, that I cannot now fulfill

my promise of exposing in detail the grievous delusions under which my opponent is laboring with regard to the Ancient Liturgies."

Ha! Ha!! Ha!!! "Grievous delusions," indeed! O! O!! Cicero expressed his wonder how two Roman Augurs could meet without laughing in each other's face. Perhaps Bishop Kingdon and his Vicar will give us the secret—if they can stand the test. Your readers now see who is the victim of the "grievous delusions." An Anglo-Ritualist had better not refer to the Eastern Church, Orthodox or Schismatic, when looking for arguments against the Western Church. Let him remember the Rev. Mr. Williams' words to Pusey:

"It cannot, I think, be denied that the Orthodox Greek Church does even surpass the Church of Rome in their exaltation of the Blessed Virgin in their devotions."

NINTH AND TENTH LETTERS.—These will not detain us long. He proposes to consider:

"Whether my opponent has produced satisfactory evidence to show that Gen. iii. 15, with its corrupt *Ipsa*, is not the text relied on by Roman theologians as the *Chief Scripture foundation* for the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary?"

His argument in reply to the question, is simply that of his first *Strictures* written backwards, Hebraically so to speak, and it is but a re-hash of his audacious, insolent, unprincipled, mendacious, and satanically malevolent calumnies. I have given your readers some account of the immense literature on the gender of the pronoun in Gen. iii. 15—*Ipse*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*—amongst Catholic Theologians; I have shown that they take either side—*Ipse*, *Ipsum*, or *Ipsa*, without feeling that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was at all dependent on either; I have shown, moreover, that whatever support the doctrine has in the text is claimed to be drawn from the first clause; and, I have stated, over and over again, in the most luminous manner, the Catholic sense of *Ipsa* as taught by the ablest theologians in the Church, to say nothing of the learned Protestants, Grotius and Tischendorf. Has the Vicar quoted *one solitary dissentient voice*? NOT ONE! Whose word, then,

will your readers take on Catholic doctrine? That of this wretchedly ignorant and insolent "sacerdotal pretender," backed up by his Episcopal godfather, or ALL the Theologians of the Catholic Church?

For an answer to his rubbish here on his own quotation from Father Schouppe, read the fourteenth letter of my *Rejoinder*.

ELEVENTH LETTER.—Here he begs to introduce "another small item of considerable interest and importance" in further support of the contention of his last two letters. Well, it is a "small item" sure enough. For, it is a criticism on the Bull *Ineffabilis* by a so-called "prominent and eminent divine" of the Russian Church. Now, his *divinity* (save the mark!) is exactly of the same grade as that of Bishop Kingdon and his Vicar. What do your readers think the "criticism" is? Simply a repetition of the *stuff* uttered by the Bishop and his scribe on *Ipsa*! Indeed, the Vicar has evidently borrowed his very words for his own argument! And this is the witness "trotted out" to testify that the Eastern Church did not believe in the Immaculate Conception! What disgusting impudence!

The Vicar intimates that I will "perhaps" put "this venerable, learned, and prominent Russian divine" (as he calls him) in the category of "ignoramuses—with Dr. Pusey, Bishop Wordsworth, Bishop Kingdon, and many others." Well, as to their Lordships of Lincoln and Fredericton judged by their utterances on this question, I think the "Russian divine" could not be in better company; and, not to disappoint the Vicar, or treat his Oriental friend inhospitably, I impale him with them. The Russian bear and the British lion do not often so happily consort; but now that they are *sans* teeth, *sans* claws, *sans* everything save their *divinity*, they will not hurt each other.

"Repentance is second innocence." I allow the plea in Pusey's behalf. I alleged that he, on being instructed by Cardinal Newman and Bishop Dupanloup as to its true meaning as defined by the Catholic Church, did not reject the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. I challenged the Vicar to

deny my assertion;—he never even referred to my challenge. The coward! He tried to conjure with Pusey's name and the *first* volume of the *Eirenicon*, but he throws him overboard on account of the *second* volume. Shame! shame!!

Now, what is the truth about the belief of the Eastern Church on the Immaculate Conception? The belief exists to-day among the Schismatic Greeks, and even among those Oriental sects which have been separated from the Church of Christ from the time of Nestorius and Eutyches. This is clear from the fact that in 1691, Father Joseph Besson, Superior of the Society of Jesus in Syria and Persia, before three Patriarchs and an Archbishop, in presence of Francois Baron, the French Consul, proved from more than two hundred passages, taken from the oldest liturgical books, that all the churches and Oriental peoples believed in the preservation of Mary from the stain of original sin. His proof was openly and candidly acknowledged by the Prelates present, who signed, then and there, the declaration that "Mary was always free and exempt from original sin, as very many of the ancient holy Fathers, the teachers of the Oriental Church have explained." (See Gargarin, *L'Eglise Russe et l'Immaculée Conception*, Paris, 1876; Hurter's *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 2, p. 379.) Exit the "learned divine."

Under his "fifth head" in this letter, the Vicar returns to the question of the Invocation of Saints. He admits that the practice arose early in the Church, and has existed for centuries both in her Eastern and Western Branches; but he says:

"Careful study of the whole question has strengthened my conviction that the Church of England acted most wisely and in strict accordance with her truth-loving character at the Reformation, when she rejected *in toto* the practice of invoking Saints and Angels."

"The Church of England," did he say? This so-called Church exists only in idea; there is no such a thing in fact. The reality is but a bundle of conflicting sects exhibiting to the world, at this very moment, a horrible scene of discord and confusion. Döllinger, one of the Vicar's *pets*, well describes Anglican doctrines. They are, he says:

"A collection of heterogeneous theological propositions tied together by the Act of Uniformity; propositions which, in a logical mind, cannot exist by the side of one another, and whose effect upon the English churchman is that he finds himself involved in contradictions and disingenuousness, and can only escape the painful consciousness of it by sophistical reasoning."

During this discussion the Vicar has used Döllinger's name against me very often. Over the freshly-closed grave of this unfortunate man, I do not propose to utter a word beyond an expression of my sincere gratitude for his intellectual services to Catholic truth. "I am with that Döllinger whose teaching in former days filled his disciples with love and enthusiasm for the Church and the Holy See, but I have nothing in common with that Döllinger whom the enemies of the Church and of the Holy See load with praises." I adopt these words of the illustrious Bishop Von Ketteler.

"Turn about is fair play," we are told. Let us read Döllinger's judgment of this "Church of England," so-called. I quote from his great work entitled "The Church and the Churches; or, The Papacy and the Temporal Power," McCabe's translation:

"There is no Church that is so completely and thoroughly as the Anglican, the product and expression of the wants and wishes, the modes of thought and cast of character, not of a certain nationality, but of a fragment of a nation, namely, the rich, fashionable, and cultivated classes. It is the religion of deportment, of gentility, of clerical reserve. Religion and the Church are then required to be above all things, not troublesome, not intrusive, not presuming, not importunate" (p. 145).

"The laws from the time of the Tudors, Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, declare the Supremacy over the Church to be an inalienable prerogative of the Crown. These statutes still exist in full force. The King or the reigning Queen is in possession of the Church ecclesiastical power, and that of the Bishops is only an emanation of the Royal authority" (p. 155).

"Besides the Ministers and the Parliament, 'the Privy Council,' since 1833, exercises a supremacy over religion or the Church. It was appointed by Parliament to be the Supreme Court of Appeal in

ecclesiastical disputes, whether concerning doctrine or discipline, and consists wholly or chiefly of laymen, who are in part not even members of the Established Church" (p. 156).

"When about the same time a desire for a certain independent Synodical action arose, the (London) *Times* said: 'It ought to be considered that this Church, to which the Parliament had given its present form, possesses every attribute, every advantage, and every disadvantage of a compromise. Her Articles and authorized Formularies are so drawn as to admit within her pale, persons differing as widely as it is possible for the professors of the Christian religion to differ from each other. Unity was neither sought nor obtained; but comprehension was aimed at and accomplished. Therefore we have within the Church of England persons differing not merely in their particular tenets, but in the rule and ground of their belief'" (p. 157).

"The Bishops are, on the whole, powerless concerning doctrine and discipline; and for fear of a long and expensive lawsuit, they seldom venture to proceed against a beneficed clergyman" (p. 157).

"The inextricable contradiction between the Thirty-nine Articles which are essentially Calvinistic, and the strongly Catholicized Liturgy originated in the circumstance of the age of the Reformation. The Articles were to be the dogmatic fetters binding the clergy to Calvinism, and were only laid before them for signature. But the Liturgy, with its prayers and sacramental forms, was intended to prove to the people, who were still more Catholic than Protestant, and who had to be threatened with pecuniary fines before they would attend the service, that their religion had not been sensibly altered, and that the Old Catholic Church still really existed" (p. 159).

"Each of the two great parties in the Church cast on each other an aspersion of hypocrisy and disingenuousness with equal right; for the one cannot sign the Calvinistic Articles with inward conviction, and the other can only accept the Liturgy, for which they have an antipathy, for the sake of the benefits they receive, and are obliged to wrest the meaning of liturgical forms in the most violent manner" (p. 160).

"It may be said of the English Church, that it is like an Indian idol, with many heads (and every one with different views) but very few hands" (p. 171).

"On the whole the entire existence of the Established Church is seriously threatened, and its dissolution only a question of time. It is completely in the power of the House of Commons and of the Cabinet constituted by the majority of that House, which already counts among its members a considerable number of Dissenters who are all enemies of the State Church, as well as Catholics, and it is not necessary to mention the Jews. . . . The dissolution of this ill-connected organism will then follow; the profounder and more earnest minds will withdraw from a Church in which the double yoke of governmental authority and compulsory communion with a foreign doctrine, will not allow them in honor and conscience any longer to remain " (p. 173).

In the face of this crushing indictment of the so-called "Church of England," how grim is the humor of the Vicar's use of Döllinger's name in this controversy! Mark, too, that in these extracts he is dealing with no debatable questions such as led him into revolt against the Church, whose authority nobody, more distinctly and emphatically than he, had proclaimed and defended. He here states purely historico-legal propositions which the world knows to be facts. The consequences, too, which Döllinger foresaw must inevitably result from these facts, are in full bloom in the "Church of England" to-day.

I am now in conflict with a representative of one of those sects which are battling within the bosom of the Church of England, namely, Ritualism. Let me illustrate the truth of Döllinger's words, by giving your readers some examples of Ritualistic practice in the Invocation of Saints.

My first quotation will be from one of their books entitled "The Little Prayer Book," which we are told is intended chiefly for *beginners* in Devotion, and has been revised and corrected by three priests. "*Beginners in devotion*," mark you! It contains instructions for Confession, and the Penitent, when making his Confession to the Priest, is instructed to say: "I confess to Almighty God, to *Blessed Mary*, to *all Saints*, and to thee, my ghostly Father, that I have sinned . . . wherefore *I beg Blessed Mary, all Saints*, and thee, my ghostly Father, to *pray to the Lord our God for me*." A Petition to be used after Holy Communion runs as follows:

“Let the glorious and ever-Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, the Blessed Apostles, Martyrs and Virgins, and all the Court of Heaven make supplication unto Thee on our behalf.” Then we have Hymns: “To the Holy Mother of God,” and she is described as “the all-holy, undefiled, and more than Blessed Mary, Mother of God.” This book also contains a hymn, “To my Holy Angel Guardian,” in which these verses occur:

“Then for thy sake, dear Angel, now,
More humble will I be:
But I am weak and when I fall,
O weary not of me!

“Then, love me, love me, Angel dear,
And I will love thee more;
And help me, when my soul is cast
Upon the eternal shore.”

Again we have another devotional book called *The English Catholic's Vade Mecum*. This contains Litanies of the Saints and Angels. I could fill columns with the same sort of thing from the most popular manuals of the Ritualistic sect. I have in my *Rejoinder* (twenty-seventh letter), quoted from Littledale's book—*Devotions to the Saints*. I ask your readers to refer to the extracts. The book is extensively used by Ritualists to-day. The Vicar says that “the maturer views” of Littledale are not in accord with those he expressed in the “Preface” to this book, and which I have quoted in the *Rejoinder*. What a confession! What a confirmation of Döllinger's indictment. Now mark. The Twenty-second Article of the famous Thirty-nine, says:

“The Romish Doctrine concerning . . . (the) Invocation of Saints is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.”

Now at his ordination Littledale “signed” these Articles, and made the Vicar's “priestly vow” to “be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word.” But ten years

afterwards, in the face of the above Article and his "priestly vow" to obey its injunctions, Littledale publicly advocates the practice of the Invocation of the Saints, replies to objections against it, and proclaims that the Christian who neglects it "fails to avail himself of a privilege." The Vicar now informs us that his Master, and "Scholar" of the *Church Times* has changed his "views." That is it, precisely. "The English Church," says Döllinger, "is like an Indian idol, with many heads (and every one with different views)." To have "views" and to be "viewy" is the sum and substance of Anglican teaching; and it is a matter of the very least consequence, whether the views of to-day contradict the Thirty-nine Articles or be in accord with the views of yesterday. Indeed, the more widely the views of a Parson differ from each other, from day to day, the better—since he thereby exhibits to perfection that *viewiness* which is the leading feature of Anglican theology. Littledale's vagaries on the Invocation of Saints illustrate this to a nicety. When he "signed" the Articles and made his "priestly vows" he had one set of views; when he wrote the "Preface" to the book entitled "Devotions for the Communion of Saints," he had another set; and now the Vicar announces that he has still another! "Comprehension was aimed at and accomplished" in the Church of England, say the *London Times* and Döllinger. I should think so.

And now let me call attention, on the same subject, to the *Treasury of Devotion*, a popular book with Ritualists in this Province—yes, in the "Mission Church" in this very city. It is pirated almost *verbatim* from our prayer books, especially from our *Golden Manual*. It has prayers for the intercession of Saints and Angels. Here is one:

"May the intercessions of the holy Mother of God, of the Prophets, of the holy Apostles, of the Martyrs, help me! May all the Saints and Elect of God pray for me, that I may be worthy with them to possess the Kingdom of God. Amen."

And again:

"May the holy Angels, especially my own Guardian, keep watch around me throughout this night, to protect me against the assaults

of the evil one, to suggest to me holy thoughts, to defend me against all dangers, to lead me in the perfect way of peace, and to bring me safe at length, to my home in Heaven. Amen."

And again, in the prayers for the Dead (when the soul has departed) :

"May the Holy Ones of God succor him; may the Angels of God receive and bear his soul and present it before the Face of the Most High.

V. May Christ, Who has called thee, receive thee; may the Angels carry thee into Abraham's bosom.

R. Receive his soul, and present it before the Face of the Most High!

V. Grant him eternal rest, O Lord; and let perpetual light shine upon him.

R. May the Angels of God receive and bear his soul, and present it before the Face of the Most High.

"This is '*comprecation*' only, which, notwithstanding my change of view, I still think quite defensible," exclaims Little-dale, as quoted by the Vicar. Rubbish! The distinction is as obsolete as the *word*. Here we have a sample of "jesuitical" jugglery in true ritualistic style. Is it not beneath contempt?

I have said that the *Treasury of Devotion* was a "crib"—especially from our *Golden Manual*. Let me give your readers an opportunity to test my statement, in the above prayers for the Dead. Here is the language of the *Golden Manual*:

"Come to his assistance, ye Saints of God; come forth to meet him, ye Angels of the Lord, receiving his soul, offering it in the sight of the Most High.

V. May Christ receive thee, Who hath called thee, and may the Angels conduct thee to Abraham's bosom.

R. Receiving his soul, offering it in the sight of the Most High.

V. Eternal rest give unto him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him.

R. Offering it in the sight of the Most High.

What do your readers think of that? The simple fact is that the "Priest," who "compiled" the *Treasury*, gives a slightly different English translation of the Latin of the *Golden Manual* from that which the *Golden Manual* itself has. That

is absolutely the only difference. I see no room for choice between them. But now for the joke of this farce.

The "Priest" who "compiled" the *Treasury* "desires to withhold his name," and the book is edited by the Rev. "Father" (!) Carter, one of the most notorious Ritualists in England. In the Preface to the "third edition" of the book Carter says:

"In preparing the *Treasury* the desire was to supply a body of devotions in faithful accordance with the truest standards of the mind of the Church of England, and, in trust that this rule had been observed, it was thought better to commit the book to the test of general approval rather than seek any authoritative sanction to its contents."

"The truest standards of the mind of the Church of England," according to the Ritualist Carter, are to be found in Catholic Prayer Books—and in the shape of prayers invocatory of the Saints and Angels, and for the Dead, both of which are condemned by the Twenty-second of the Thirty-nine Articles! Do your readers wonder that "it was thought better" not to "seek any authoritative sanction" for the *Treasury*? Imagine the Rectors of the "Stone Church" and of "Trinity," in this city, reciting from the *Treasury* its prayers for the Dead over the remains of some deceased member of their congregation! I do believe that so far as the late lamented member was concerned, it would prove to be but a case of *suspended animation*.

In the face of all this, need I weary your readers with another word on the *in-toto* rejection by the Church of England, of the Invocation of Saints? The practice is spreading every day in spite of the Thirty-nine Articles—and the Ritualists deserve all the credit for it. And yet these hypocritical pseudo-"priests" daily insult their Teacher—the Catholic Church, the True Witness who has been teaching for nearly two thousand years the very truths which *they* have been rehearsing for about *twenty*, which they learned by listening outside her door, and but for her would never have learned at all.

TWELFTH LETTER.—The same subject is continued in this

letter without a particle of argument not fully answered in my *Rejoinder*.

THIRTEENTH LETTER.—The best thing in this is a sort of Index to the information given him in my *Rejoinder*. Thanks! The balance of it is a long quotation from Cardinal Newman's "Letter to Pusey," which I have already fully discussed. The closing words are: "They seem to me like a bad dream." This, too, I have explained in the twenty-fifth letter of my *Rejoinder*.

FOURTEENTH, FIFTEENTH, AND SIXTEENTH LETTERS.—I am here reminded that "the way of him that is laden with guilt is exceedingly crooked." He continues to repeat in these letters all manner of rubbish on the Invocation of Saints, St. Liguori, and the *Raccolta*. Evidently, "this way madness lies." What, I ask your honest readers, what is the use of it all, in the face of the very full explanation I have given of Catholic doctrine, and in the face of the quotations I have made from Ritualistic books of devotion? Ritualistic practice admits our *principle*, and no amount of such *stuff* as we have here can avail with honest men.

He has, however, dared to accuse me of garbling. As usual, the accusation is the offspring of his malice, and a deliberate attempt to misrepresent. Now, mark. In the eighteenth letter of the *Rejoinder* I was not discussing the Invocation of Saints, and therefore did not even refer to it. I was engaged in showing the homage the WORLD paid to the great maternal sanctity of the ever-blessed Mother. I alleged that only the Ritualist controversialist of the Littledale stripe is better when he treats of Her. To prove this assertion, I gave selections from the writings of Bishops Hall, Pearson, and Hicks, and from those of George Herbert, Keble, and Frank—"a few choice minds in Anglicanism," but I took care to point out that their thoughts were not Anglican thoughts; their true home was the Catholic Church. And now the Vicar accuses me of "garbling," because having called these writers as witnesses to one point, I did not also offer their evidence on an-

other point absolutely alien to the question in hand. What a mud-head! This explains very clearly the disgraceful confusion, and the utter lack of logical argument that characterizes the *Strictures*.

Again he returns to St. Liguori's *Glories of Mary* and the *Raccolta*. He says:

"These devotional books, WE KNOW (!) abound in direct appeals to the Virgin for every kind of gift, temporal and eternal."

Now, if he means by this to assert that these books either encourage or authorize Catholics to suppose that our Blessed Lady has power *in herself* to bestow spiritual gifts or temporal gifts either, then it is a calumny either very criminal in its ignorance or quite characteristically satanic in its malevolence. From my knowledge of the debauched state of the man's mind, I believe it to be both. For we Catholics know, on the contrary, that there is not even the most superficial *appearance* of such a result ensuing. Indeed, the very cause of that spiritual attraction which devotion to Mary possesses for the great body of Catholics, is their regarding her as a fellow-creature,—else, I admit, it would be absolutely indefensible.

But if he means to assert that these books encourage a reliance on the intercession of the Mother of Jesus with her Adorable Son to obtain from Him *spiritual* and *temporal* gifts for those who strive to imitate her virtues—then, well may I ask him, in the words of St. Paul: "Did (this) Word of God come out from you or came it only to you?" For once he is in accord with Holy Scripture, and I felicitate him on his blunder: he never meant it.

Does the Bible encourage this reliance? *First*, as to spiritual gifts. Why, the very first miracle wrought by our Divine Saviour was in the spiritual or supernatural order, and it was wrought through His Blessed Mother's mediation. The mystery of the Incarnation had no sooner been accomplished in Mary, than she rose up and went into the hill country "with haste," to visit her cousin Elizabeth. What was the result of the interview between these two highly-favored women? More stupendous than the creation of worlds. "And it came to pass

that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the infant leaped in her womb." Now the Catholic belief, in which Pusey heartily concurred, is that John the Baptist was sanctified, was cleansed from original sin, at the moment when he "leaped" in Elizabeth's bosom; and the precise moment chosen for its accomplishment was when the voice of Mary's greeting sounded in Elizabeth's ears. For Christ then spoke by the mouth of His Mother, and John heard by the ears of Elizabeth. No sooner has Mary spoken than Elizabeth "was filled with the Holy Ghost, and she cried out with a loud voice and said: Blessed art thou amongst women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me that the Mother of my Lord should visit me? For behold, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the infant in my womb *leaped for joy.*"

"And whence is this to me that the Mother of my Lord should visit me?" What a marvellous speech! The very God Incarnate was also present at the very same moment; and yet Elizabeth speaks explicitly, not of His visit, but of His Mother's! Mary is now the Temple of the Holy Ghost, filled with His presence, so that it overflows all around. She had told nothing to Elizabeth, but the very voice of her salutation has sufficed. I do not at all attempt to draw out the awful significance of the simple Gospel recital, or to voice the soul-stirring, heart-piercing, reason-bewildering reflections suggested by it. Able hands and loving Catholic hearts have done all that, and I need not intrude.

Now, will the Vicar deny that in this instance Mary was the medium of spiritual gifts and graces to St. John the Baptist? Yes, he would give the lie to God Himself, as he has done before, to score a point against Rome.

And *second*, as to temporal gifts. Here again the very first *public* miracle performed by our Blessed Lord was in the temporal or physical order, and it, too, was performed at Cana through Mary's intercession. "*They have no wine.*" How exquisitely tender is the thoughtfulness implied in these few and simple words! The heart of the woman and the mother speaks. "They have no wine,"—that seems to us but a trifling

matter, only a question of a little chagrin and annoyance to the hosts and young married folks, and not an occasion of sufficient solemnity for the first display of Christ's Divine Power. But Mary, full of tenderness for the natural feelings of her friends, feels for their embarrassment, and *unsolicited* interests herself for their relief. She has perfect faith and confidence both in the power and in the goodness of her Divine Son. She does not command, she does not even ask. She confines herself to the most simple statement of their wants. "They have no wine"—she whispered to Him whose creative *fiat* first broke the silence of eternity, and rather than reject a mother's prayer, He anticipated the eternal decrees :

The modest water saw its God—and *blushed* !
Nympha pudica Deum vidit et erubuit.

Will the Vicar deny that in "this beginning of miracles" there is any evidence of the power of Mary's influence with her Divine Son? And will he also deny that there is anything to encourage us to have recourse to her intercession for even temporal gifts?

The Son of God in His Sacred Humanity, not, of course, in His Divine Nature, nor in any matter which is proper to Him only in that nature, was subject to Mary here, and obeyed her (St. Luke ii. 51); and as the two natures remain in Him forever distinct, two natures in one person, I know no reason for supposing that the relation, and whatever pertains essentially to it, between the Mother and the Son in His human nature, are not precisely, save that both are now in a glorified state, what they were when on earth. We are not to suppose the soul loses in the future life the habits of this, and therefore we must suppose that the habit of obedience, love, and reverence of our Divine Lord to His holy Mother here are still retained. Therefore, we conclude surely that her will, always one with God's will, because moved by the Divine charity, is still regarded by Him as the will of His Mother, and has that weight with Him that the right will of a mother must always have with a good, loving son.

Since, then, *for her sake*, at the wedding at Cana He even

anticipated the hour He had resolved upon for the manifestation of His own glory, what may we not expect that He will do for her when the hour of glorifying her throughout all the the earth is come?

In the twenty-third letter of the *Rejoinder*, I drew out a parallel between those objections which the Protestant is so fond of adducing against the Catholic veneration of Mary, and those which a Unitarian might allege against the worship of Jesus Christ. Now, of course, every believer in the Trinity who has practiced the worship of the God-Man, knows experimentally that there lurks a monstrous fallacy in the Unitarian's argument. But, then, in like manner, every Catholic who has practiced devotion to our Blessed Lady, knows experimentally that there lurks a monstrous fallacy in the *Protestant's* argument. Referring to this parallel, the Vicar makes this cowardly statement :

"His long and flimsy argument in the person of an Unitarian, claims no remarks. Any tyro in a divinity school could as easily as my opponent 'draw out an overwhelming Trinitarian answer.'"

Indeed! But this Ritualistic "tyro" does not attempt it. O, no! Something more than a supply of divinity "scraps" is required to meet the Unitarian's objection. Let me, then, assure Bishop Kingdon that, when he puts forward a "tyro" competent to give an unanswerable reply to the Unitarian, I will be on hand to give a reply, equally unanswerable, to those objections urged by Protestants against the Catholic's devotion to "Mary the Mother of Jesus."

One word more on these Letters. Bishop Colenso, Pusey's "heathen," but a name of far greater authority in the Anglican Church than that of Bishop Kingdon will ever be, in writing to the *London Times*, quoted *eleven* texts of Scripture to prove that prayer ought not to be offered to our Blessed Lord. Again: all the world still remembers the No-Popery frenzy that broke out in England when Pius IX. re-established there the Catholic Hierarchy. On that occasion the mob, feeling by a true instinct that it could do nothing else so painful to all Catholics, proceeded publicly to burn in effigy the

ever Blessed Mother of their Saviour, and (who can write it without a shudder!) even our Divine and Crucified Redeemer. They knew not what they did. The insult was intended, not for Him, but for Catholics. Who was the more consistent—the English mob, or Pusey's Episcopal “heathen”?

SEVENTEENTH LETTER.—The object of this letter is, to cover up the infamy that attaches to his publication of the forged speech of Bishop Strossmayer, in the columns of the *Church Eclectic*. He manages to repeat, over and over again, the rubbish of the anonymous scribblers and defamers—*Janus*, *Quirinus*, and *Pomponio Leto*. This sort of evidence is the very life-blood of the Ritualist brain. Happily, now-a-days, intelligent men do not form their judgments on such authority.

He adduces, too, a private letter to support a contemptible calumny on the memory of the honored dead—His Grace, the late Archbishop Connolly. This was so effectively disposed of at the time by His Lordship, Bishop Rogers of Chatham, that I give his letter in the *Appendix A*.

Now, his conduct in regard to the forged speech of Bishop Strossmayer is simply vile. In one breath he admits its spuriousness, in another he asserts that substantially it came “from the lips of the eminent Croation Bishop himself.” And yet he wriggles and squirms; but he winds up by rebaptizing his own monstrosity with Ritualistic “bell, book, and candle,” and says:

“I shall be glad to forward a copy of it to any person who will send me a stamped and addressed envelope and a two-cent stamp.” What impious malignity and mendacity! Only shortly before he had told your readers, that some anonymous donor had sent him *a copy*. Now he confesses that he has a stock on hand, and is only intent on recouping his loss on a bad investment. The “copy” he advertises, is published at “*one-halfpenny*,” and he says nothing to his prospective customers about the *discount*, which the pamphlet announces will be allowed to persons purchasing “quantities for gratuitous distribution.” That is hardly fair; but I will be satisfied if he inform the public, through your columns, that he has ex-

pended the profits of the transaction in "evangelizing the heathen"—that is to say, in spreading genuine Ritualistic principles and practices, among the Rectors of the Anglican Churches and their congregations in this city, who now so cordially anathematize him and Ritualism.

Let us now hope, however, that this cowardly libel on the venerated Bishop Strossmayer is at an end. Since I finished my *Rejoinder*, the Bishop has written a letter anent this forgery to Bishop Maes, of Covington, Kentucky, who had sent him the "famous speech." I give it in the *Appendix B*. Comment is needless.

There is a wondrous law of compensation running through human existence. The unfortunate Pigott, when caught in a like infamy with that of the Vicar, paid the penalty of outraged truth with his life, and like another Judas, "went out" and blew out his miserable and mischievous brains. How does the Vicar propose to atone for *his* crime?

EIGHTEENTH LETTER.—Here he returns once more to the unhappy Littledale and his *Plain Reasons*, the Vicar's theological text-book and *vade mecum*. It need not detain us long. I alleged that it had been "kicked out" by the "Protestant Defence Association." This is true, and the Vicar has not dared to deny it. I also referred shortly to the arraignment of the book by the Rev. Dr. Lee, an Anglican clergyman. For the sake of the numerous Protestant witnesses I give his letter in the *Appendix C*. Father Ryder's *Catholic Controversy* is an answer in detail to the *Plain Reasons*.

NINETEENTH LETTER.—Here again he displays the most shocking malice and bewildering ignorance in what he asserts "concerning the presence of the Blessed Virgin in the Eucharist," as he expresses it. Let your readers turn to the twenty-sixth letter of the *Rejoinder* for a full and clear answer to his stupid calumnies here. His "opponent's edition of it" can, and will be accepted by all honest men, who value truth and desire to learn the true Catholic teaching.

I beg, however, to ask thoughtful attention to some other

remarks here. In the opening letter of his first *Strictures*, he proclaimed that he was bound by his "priestly vow" to "be ready with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word." Let us see how he has kept the "vow."

He writes as follows:

"The next exaggeration to be exposed is based upon the unwarrantable assumption that the Blessed Virgin had full knowledge of all that was implied in Gabriel's message; that she fully realized that she bore in her body a Divine Person."

That is, if he knows what he says, he denies that Mary realized the mystery of the Incarnation wrought in her by the power and operation of the Holy Ghost. What more could an avowed atheist say? Did Pusey's Episcopal "heathen," Colenso, ever utter a blasphemy more contrary to "God's Word"?

Let us consider, then, for a moment the tremendously awful interview between the Archangelic messenger and Mary, set down from Mary's own lips in St. Luke's Gospel. God's envoy unfolds to her in detail the Royal secret with which he had been entrusted:

"Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a Son; and thou shalt call His name Jesus.

"He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David His father: and He shall reign in the house of Jacob forever,

"And of His Kingdom there shall be no end.

"And Mary said to the Angel: How shall this be done, because I know not man?

"And the Angel answering said to her: The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee; and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore also the Holy which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.

"And Mary said: Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it done unto me according to thy word."

But the Vicar asserts that Mary did not "fully realize" the consequences of the consent thus given! Well, consider again, Mary's visit to Elizabeth:

"And (Mary) entered into the house of Zachary, and saluted Elizabeth.

"And it came to pass, that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the infant leaped in her womb: and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost:

"And she cried out with a loud voice, and said: Blessed art thou among women; and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.

"And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?

"For behold, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the infant in my womb leaped for joy.

"And blessed art thou that hast believed; because those things shall be accomplished that were spoken to thee by the Lord."

Now Mary had not disclosed her mighty secret even to this saint, her cousin. But Elizabeth "was filled with the Holy Ghost," and by His infused light she understood the mystery of the Incarnation which God had wrought in Mary. In raptures of delight and astonishment, Elizabeth pronounced her blessed above all other women, because she was made by God the instrument of His blessing to the world, and of removing the malediction which through Eve had been entailed on mankind. But the "fruit of her womb" Elizabeth called blessed in a sense still infinitely higher, because He was the boundless source of all the graces, by whom only Mary herself was blessed. Then Elizabeth, turning her eyes upon herself, cried out—*Whence is this to me that the Mother of my Lord should visit me?* She calls the Child of Mary her Lord, signifying that she knew He was God; and she declares herself honored far above her deserts, to have received the visit of the Mother of God. She herself had conceived one greater than the prophets, but Mary held in her bosom the eternal Son of God, Himself true God. But bound by his "priestly vow" the Vicar denies that Mary "fully realized" what Elizabeth by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, here proclaims "with a loud voice"—so that even he might hear.

What, again, shall I say of the *Magnificat*—that prophetic announcement of the glory of Christ and His Mother? It is not for me, in this place, to draw out the sublime reflections it suggests to the Catholic heart. For my present purpose it

is enough simply to read it: "And Mary said: My soul doth magnify the Lord: and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." "*In God my Saviour*," sings Mary. "That is an exaggeration"—cries the Vicar,—“she did not ‘fully realize’ what she was saying!” “Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. Because He that is mighty hath done great things to me: and holy is His name”—proclaims Mary. "That is another mistake"—cries the Vicar,—“she had no idea what the ‘great things’ were which the Almighty had done to her.” Could any one have imagined beforehand that a professed believer in Christianity would make so wild an assertion as that which I have here been considering?

Beyond the above suggestions, I do not propose to discuss, at this stage, Mary's place according to the Gospels. My challenge on that subject still stands. But do Protestants ever reflect on the importance of her testimony as a witness to the Gospel? The grand mystery of our Faith is the Incarnation of the Word of God. In the Divinity of Christ the whole of Christianity is summed up, and it is but an empty sound—for Redemption vanishes away, the Cross falls—if the Crucified was not God.

Now, it has pleased God that there should be but one witness to the truth of this fundamental mystery, upon which the whole doctrine of the Apostles hangs; that one person only should be our guarantee with regard to those details which chiefly characterize the Incarnation,—and this sole witness, this one guarantee of our Faith, is Mary of Nazareth. This fact is indisputable. She was alone with the Angel when the great mystery was announced and accomplished. It was from her only that the Apostles could receive the knowledge of it, and transmit that knowledge to us. And if, says St. Ambrose, St. John speaks more clearly, and after a more sublime manner than the rest, of the mysteries of the Incarnate Word, it is because he was more closely connected with her who was the very Temple in which those heavenly mysteries were accomplished. God, moreover, chose that Mary should be the faithful and mute depositary of this mystery during the whole time of her Son's life upon earth; He chose that she should keep

the secret inviolable during all these years. The Heavens, Angels, and the very stars will proclaim His Birth and His glory. Prophets and Saints will receive Him in His Temple; the Apostles and great wonders on earth and in heaven will herald His work to the very ends of the world. All the mighty ones of the earth, all the saints, wise men and kings, all peoples will acknowledge Him and pay homage to His power. *And all this Mary knew.* The Angel had announced it to her, and presently after, in the *Magnificat*, the Holy Ghost inspired her with words of prophecy which *allude* to her secret but do not *betray* it. Even Calvin admits all this. He says :

“God chose that the treasure of this exalted mystery (the Incarnation) should be made over to the charge of the Virgin, and be as though buried in her heart, in order that shortly afterwards, when the fitting time was come, it might be communicated to all the faithful” (Calvin’s *Commentary upon the Harmony of the Gospels*, p. 49).

Mary is therefore our only witness, not alone to the Incarnation, but also to the Visitation, to the Nativity, to the Adoration of the Wise Men, to the Presentation in the Temple, to the Flight into Egypt, to the Wisdom of Jesus among the Doctors, and to the first thirty years of the Life of our Divine Lord upon earth. This is expressed in the Gospel in quite a characteristic way. When speaking of the great testimonies borne to Jesus during His infancy, it repeats *three* times: “*And Mary kept all these words and pondered them in her heart.*” “That is to say,” observes Calvin, a second time, “that this treasure was entrusted to her to keep it in her heart, until the fitting time came when it was to be made manifest to others.” Observe, too, that in spite of very critical circumstances that might have seemed to make it the duty of the Blessed Virgin—certainly, her interest—to speak sooner, yet she kept the secret locked up in her own breast so long as Jesus remained upon earth. Her husband, St. Joseph, in the inscrutable providence of God, is allowed to conceive doubts of Mary’s chastity, yet even under this most painful trial she does

not open her mouth to reveal her Divine Maternity, but in silent patience awaits her justification from God. But now the time is come that she should speak, and the secrets of God's wisdom and power, and the hidden counsels of His love, whereof she alone of creatures had before been fully cognizant, are by her revealed to the Apostles and Evangelists.

"And Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart." Your readers will note that this is the language of St. Luke, in whose Gospel all the particulars of the Birth and Infancy of Jesus are far more fully recorded than by any other of the Evangelists. Speaking of the human sources of his knowledge, he says that "he has diligently attained to all things from the beginning, according as they have delivered them unto us who from the beginning were eye witnesses and ministers of the Word." Mark that significant phrase, so emphatically repeated—"from the beginning." Who was such an eye witness "from the beginning"? None but Mary. The learned Protestant commentator, Grotius—no "sacerdotal pretender"—has observed that "St. Luke seems to have mentioned this fact of Mary's habit of thoughtful meditation upon the words and deeds of her Divine Son and of others in His regard, precisely because she was the authority from whom he had received the narrative that he was recording. "*Quod ideo videtur a Luca expressum, quia ipsam habet harum narrationem Auctorem*" (Grotius, *Annot. in Quatuor Evangelia*).

It is true that the Mystery of the Incarnation had been in some measure revealed to St. Joseph by the Angel sent to reassure him as to the spotless purity of Mary and to command him to take her to his home; also to Elizabeth at the time of the Visitation, when she exclaimed: "Whence is this to me that the Mother of my Lord should come to visit me"? But both of these witnesses, there is every reason to believe, had been dead long before the close of our Lord's life upon earth, and we may be quite certain that God did not allow these hidden things to be revealed before His Resurrection, according to His own express command with reference to the Transfiguration and other tokens of His Divinity. I repeat, then, Mary

was the one only witness who could speak to the very foundation of the Christian Faith. Her pure heart is thus our Lord's first Gospel. In that virginal and maternal heart, now consecrated by a whole life of silence, of humility, and of holy reserve, we read transcribed by St. Luke, the account of the great event of the Incarnation of the Son of God. To that event, as to their basis, all the other events and all the other evangelical mysteries refer. Whence the beautiful saying of St. Ildephonsus, when he calls the Blessed Mother "God's Evangelist, under whose discipline the Word made a Child was brought up."

My object, in what I have just said, has been simply to suggest to thoughtful Protestants the beautiful harmony and proportion of everything connected with Mary's position in the Gospel record of the scheme of Man's Redemption; and furthermore to ask them this question: Whose doctrine in her regard is the more *evangelical*? *Yours*—who see in her an ordinary woman, a saint it may be, but nothing more, or *ours*—who confess her to be Mother of God, our Redeemer, and who render her the honor due to that dignity?

To proceed. In this connection, and to give some color to the statement which I have just considered, the Vicar has been guilty of a most dastardly infamy. I ask the most thoughtful attention of your readers while I expose it.

In the two closing paragraphs of this letter he names these Fathers: Origen, Basil the Great, Jerome, Tertullian, Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose. He gives a quotation from St. Cyril, and then says:

"I cite them not in order to parade their opinion on certain texts as infallible authority, but simply to show that it was far from the Church's mind of the early centuries to suppose that the Virgin apprehended the mystery of which she was the willing instrument" (that is, the Incarnation).

A more monstrous falsehood was never penned. There is not ONE Father whom he can cite for any such proposition, since, as we have seen, it is directly contrary to the Gospel. It is the offspring of a malevolent heart and a muddled brain. And, moreover, he *stole* the objection, such as it is, from Car-

dinal Newman, without giving his answer, because had he done so, like Pusey he would have had nothing to say. Let me explain.

Cardinal Newman, in his "Letter" to Pusey, is inquiring into the doctrine of Antiquity on the subject of Mary's prerogatives. Now the world admits that he is a theologian too candid and fearless to put out of sight or explain away adverse facts from fear of scandal, or from the expediency of controversy. And here he proves that he merits the distinction accorded him. Pusey did not take the point in his *Eirenicon*, to which the Cardinal is replying. He raises it himself in these words:

"It is true that several great Fathers of the fourth century do imply or assert that on one or two occasions she did sin venially or showed infirmity. This is the only real objection which I know of; and as I do not wish to pass it over lightly, I propose to consider it at the end of this Letter."

And he does consider it in *Note 3* to his Letter,—a piece of exegetical writing not to be paralleled in our language. I can assure your readers that the supposed difficulty, put by Cardinal Newman himself, vanishes into thin air. The Fathers spoken of are St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Cyril of Alexandria. His commentary on these occupy twenty-four pages, and I do not propose to mangle it. In the second volume of the *Eirenicon*, which is a reply to the Cardinal's Letter, Pusey has not only not one word to say against his exposition, but, on the contrary, expresses his agreement with the Cardinal in these most striking words: "I have not spoken as those Fathers spake, for whom you apologize, and whose language you explain. *I could neither use it nor cite it, and I marvel that they used it.*" The coarse spirit of my opponent is not troubled with such delicate qualms.

But I am concerned now only with the Vicar's assertion that these Fathers show that the Blessed Virgin did not apprehend the mystery of the Incarnation. When he made this statement he had Cardinal Newman's open page before him, for from it and Littledale he "cooked up" his monstrosity. Yet St. Basil in his Epistle, on that very page, emphatically affirms that

Mary had "*the secret knowledge of the Divine Conception,*" and that she "*had been taught from above the things concerning the Lord.*" On the same page, too, and under the Vicar's eyes, St. Chrysostom says that Mary, on hearing the Angel's word, "*searched what was the nature of the salutation,*" and knew the "*clear fact*" of the Incarnation before she gave her consent. Now what is all this but the Gospel record already discussed? But what have I to say in reply to his quotation from St. Cyril? It has nothing at all to do with the question whether or not Mary "*apprehended the mystery*" of the Incarnation. Cyril is discussing whether the Blessed Virgin actually doubted at the crucifixion. Here is Cardinal Newman's answer:

"As to St. Cyril . . . he does not, strictly speaking, say more than that our Lady was grievously tempted. This does not imply sin, for our Lord was 'tempted in all things as we are, yet without sin.'"

And again, he observes:

"On the other hand, we admit, rather we maintain, that except for the grace of God, she might have sinned; and that she may have been exposed to temptation in the sense in which our Lord was exposed to it. Though as His Divine Nature made it impossible for Him to yield to it, so His grace preserved her under its assaults also."

I would ask your interested readers to compare Littledale, Cardinal Newman, and Father Ryder on the question discussed by Saints Basil, Cyril, and Chrysostom. It will amply repay them.

In the face of all this, has my criticism on the Vicar under this head been too severe? I submit that it has not. Readers familiar with the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, for instance, know his method of treating questions. He gathers up all the objections possible against the proposition or thesis he has to maintain, and he then refutes them, one by one. It is said that from the objections so put in St. Thomas' pages, Voltaire stole the matter of his attacks on religion. The Vicar simply imitates him. Cardinal Newman volunteers a seeming difficulty only to solve it for inquiring minds. The great Jesuit,

Petavius, had done the same thing, and but for the fearless honesty of the Catholic writers, Littledale would not have been able to supply the Vicar with "scraps." The Vicar now snatches up the objection, twists it out of its proper relations, and throws it like a strangled corpse into the face of the general reader, who is not always able to estimate it at its true value. And this he professes to do under the obligation of a "priestly vow"! This he does, too, while proclaiming to the world that "It has been the hard and sorrowful lot of the English Church to have to wear the appearance of those who fail to yield (the Mother of Jesus) her proper honor." The consummate hypocrite! *Avant!*

TWENTIETH LETTER.—He opens this letter with an apology for his inability to keep his "priestly vow"—in a very important particular, too. He says:

"Unfortunately I shall not be able to return, as promised, to the consideration of the Catena of questionable quotations supplied by my opponent in support of his contention in the early part of his *Rejoinder*. It is fortunate for him that my *Strictures* must be cut short."

"Fortunate for him," forsooth! What has my good or bad fortune to do with the matter? He assured your readers that he was bound by his "priestly vow" to "be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word." Now the "quotations" in the "early part" of my *Rejoinder*, are in support either of very *truth* or what is *very* "contrary to God's Word." What becomes of the "priestly vow"? The cowardly brag-gart!

But here, unfortunately for him, he furnishes your readers with a test absolute and final, of his utter indifference to "God's Word," the "Great Assize," and the "burning lake." After his confused way, he devotes another paragraph here to St. Cyril of Alexandria. He copies from Littledale's *Plain Reasons* a "scrap" of the Saint's comment on *St. John* xix. 26, and then adds:

"Let any one compare (this) commentary . . . with the extract attributed to S. Cyril of Alexandria by Romanists, given by my opponent in *GLOBE*, April 20, 1888, and judge for himself whether the two could possibly have come from the same pen. Apart from other evidence, the latter stands self-condemned."

"Attributed to St. Cyril by Romanists." This is the language he holds on the famous sermon preached by St. Cyril against the arch-heretic Nestorius, before the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), in the Cathedral Church of St. Mary in that city. In the sixth letter of my *Rejoinder* will be found the quotation from this sermon, of which the Vicar speaks. During this discussion I have challenged from your readers absolute credence for every critical statement I have made. What have I to say to his present assertion? Simply that he has again played the part of a deliberate and malignant falsifier,—that there is not a semblance of truth to support it. I have ransacked all the authorities for even *one* expression of *suspicion* of its genuineness, but have failed to find it. I need not, however, have taken the trouble. Cardinal Newman quotes part of it in his *Letters to Pusey*. Pusey in his reply (*Eirenicon*, Vol. 2, p. 29), accepts the Cardinal's extract, expands it to twice its length, and then adds: "I ADOPT IT ALL." Moreover, in a note, Pusey says:

"I have followed in some slight things a text amended from MSS., collated by my son, which I mention lest certain critics should accuse me of falsifying."

"Attributed to St. Cyril by Romanists," says this pseudo-"priest" of the "truth-loving . . . Church of England." Has iniquity ever more atrociously lied to itself? Alas! for the "priestly vow." Were the "old Catholic," Nestorius, to *come up* on the earth again (speaking *Dantesquely*), what an ally, true and tried, would he find in the "old Catholic" of the "Mission Church"!

And now I approach the beginning of the end. The worthless remains of the *Strictures* will not detain me long.

The Vicar objects to my statement that Anglicanism was begotten of the brutal lust of Henry VIII. But my authority

was Lord Campbell, Chief Justice of England. Moreover, there is but one opinion about it from Hudibras to Pusey. The "Gospel light," says Hudibras, "first beamed" in "the good old country" from the lascivious eyes of an exceedingly unpleasant daughter of Herodias. And Pusey affirms the same proposition in these words :

"Had we a S. Louis instead of a sovereign who, owning no master except his lusts, his rapacity, and his ambition, confounded all, right and wrong, the great quarrel between the Crown of England and the Pope in the sixteenth century might have been averted" (*Eirenicon*, Vol. 3, p. 180).

To offset this the Vicar "trots out" for the millionth time the old, old story. The worn-out tales of Popes, Bishops, and priests, charged with infidelity to their high calling, has been the staple of Protestant tradition and the basis of the Protestant view of the Catholic Church since Protestantism began. I will say a few words on this topic in my notes on his next letter.

TWENTY-FIRST LETTER.—He continues here the same subject. Now, granting for argument's sake that there is too much truth in the Vicar's charge, that there have been periods when much evil existed among the clergy and laity, even among the highest dignitaries of the Church. In answer to this I submit to thoughtful, honest men, that "there never was an epoch, never a year, never a day since Jesus Christ ascended into Heaven, that there has not existed on this earth, plainly visible to all men, a society of pre-eminent sanctity, notable, not only by the holiness of its doctrines, but also by the heroic sanctity of multitudes of its members, teaching, by miracles and example, both the precepts and the counsels of the Lord Jesus. There never was a time when the evil lives of the Church's children were not evidently in opposition to the doctrines they professed, or rendered it difficult to distinguish the true Church from the heresies which surrounded it. The so-called dark ages (tenth and eleventh centuries), with all their abuses, were rich in saints." And, moreover, there never was a moment when the Catholic Church failed to proclaim "that it were better for

sun and moon to drop from heaven, for the earth to fail, and for all the many millions who are on it to die of starvation in extremest agony, as far as temporal affliction goes, than that one soul, I will not say should be lost, but should commit one single venial sin." This is the great and most glorious characteristic of the Catholic Church, which, writes Cardinal Newman, "has been brought home to me so closely and vividly since I have been a Catholic" (*Anglican Difficulties*, pp. 197-8).

Let the same master pen sum up for us the argumentative and controversial value of this kind of evidence against the Catholic Church :

"If Satan can so well avail himself even of the gifts and glories of the Church, it is not wonderful that he can be skilled also in his exhibition and use of those offences and scandals which are his own work in her now or in former times. My brethren, she has scandals, she has a reproach, she has a shame; no Catholic will deny it. She has ever had the reproach and shame of being the mother of children unworthy of her. She has good children,—she has many more bad. Such is the will of God, as declared from the beginning. He might have formed a pure Church; but He has expressly predicted that the cockle, sown by the enemy, shall remain with the wheat, even to the harvest at the end of the world. He pronounced that His Church should be like a fisher's net, gathering of every kind, and not examined till the evening. Nay, more than this, He declared that the bad and imperfect should far surpass the good. 'Many are called,' He said, 'but few are chosen'; and His Apostle speaks of a 'remnant saved according to the election of grace.' There is ever, then, an abundance of materials in the lives and the histories of Catholics, ready to the use of those opponents who, starting with the notion that the Holy Church is the work of the devil, wish to have some corroboration of their leading idea. Her very prerogative gives special opportunity for it; I mean, that she is the Church of all lands and of all times. If there was a Judas among the Apostles, and a Nicholas among the deacons, why should we be surprised that in the course of eighteen hundred years there should be flagrant instances of cruelty, of unfaithfulness, of hypocrisy, or of profligacy, and that not only in the Catholic people, but in high places, in royal palaces, in Bishops' households, nay, in the seat of Peter itself? Why need it surprise if, in barbarous ages or in ages of luxury, there have been bishops, or abbots, or priests who have forgotten themselves and their God, and served the world

or the flesh, and have perished in that evil service? What triumph is it, though, in a long line of between two or three hundred popes, amid martyrs, confessors, doctors, sage rulers, and loving fathers of their people, one, or two, or three are found who fulfill the Lord's description of the wicked servant, who began 'to strike the man-servants and maid-servants, and to eat and drink and be drunk.' What will come of it, though we grant that at this time or that, here or there, mistakes in policy, or ill-advised measures, or timidity, or vacillation in action, or secular maxims, or inhumanity, or narrowness of mind, have seemed to influence the Church's action or her bearing towards her children? I can only say that, taking man as he is, it would be a miracle were such offences altogether absent from her history."

Having made, then, these candid and generous admissions to the bursting out of poor human nature under the Catholic system, I might fairly ask how the same wild and raging element in us all works under the Protestant system. Why, as the public very well knows, two or three years ago this very Province was reeking with the infamies of certain Protestant ministers, and the Press throughout the Dominion and the United States daily witnesses to the like facts. What would my Protestant friends say were I such a dolt as to cite these scandals as an argument against their respective creeds? Their answer would be this: When you succeed in reconciling the presence of so much sin and evil in the world with the existence of a beneficent, omniscient, and omnipotent Creator, we will explain the vice and corruption that breaks out among our clergy and laity. I will do the same thing on our behalf when they will have made a like explanation to me. The first man born into the world killed the second; there were wicked high-priests in the history of Israel,—the first connived at the worship of the golden calf, and the last demanded the death of the God-Man, who came to save His people; and Littledale proves that the English "Reformers"—Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Jewell, Parker, Barlow, Scory & Co.—were "*utterly unredeemed villains*." Away, then, with such arguments as the Vicar and his "kidney" attempt to draw from alleged scandals in the Catholic Church. Poor human nature accounts for them all, and the daily cry of every honest heart is—"Save us, Lord, we perish."

But why, then, do I refer to the crimes of Henry VIII.? Because, as Pusey admits, they are the very rock whence Anglicanism is hewn out. To avoid repetition, I ask your readers to turn here to the last six paragraphs of the ninth letter of the *Rejoinder*. I will now but supplement what I have there written.

I will begin by exposing a delusive dream, a very fable, nowadays much in fashion with Anglo-ritualists, and which the terror of approaching Disestablishment has constrained nearly all the various parties of the Anglican Church to adopt.

The idea is this. It is assumed as a first principle, that from Apostolic times, there has always existed a National Church in England, quite independent of Rome and the rest of Christendom. That this Church in British, Saxon, and Norman times struggled continually with the gradually usurping power of Rome, and the insidious introduction of popish doctrines, from which it was at first quite free, and against which it always protested. That this double yoke, becoming at length unbearable, the English Church, in the person of its Bishops, seized the first opportunity offered by a quarrel between Henry VIII. and the Pope, to assert her independence of papal jurisdiction, and to reform herself from popish errors.

Now, to the student of English history during the Tudor period, with the wealth of documentary evidence daily increasing, as MS. after MS. is being brought to light, the Anglican first principle can only appear as a fabulous, a monstrous delusion.

On the eve of the day when Henry VIII.'s lust was excited by the charms of Anne Boleyn, what was the state of the Church of England? She then formed two important Provinces of the one Catholic Church—Provinces in full and perfect communion with Rome, and with all the other Churches in union with the Holy See. Her faith was identically the same as that of Rome, and of these Churches. Henry VIII. had, a short time before, and in opposition to Luther, written an able theological defense of orthodox doctrine, in which the full supremacy and jurisdiction of the Pope were set forth and proved, together with the full doctrine of the Sacraments, as

taught later by the Council of Trent. For his book he received from the Pope the title of "Defender of the Faith,"—a title still appropriated by English sovereigns, male and female; his work was hailed with delight by the Bishops, clergy, and people of England. This Catholic country (none more so in Europe) was proud of its Catholic King. Will any one with any knowledge of history, maintain that King Henry's book taught a strange, un-English doctrine, personal simply to the King; that it was in opposition to the faith of the English episcopate and clergy; that it was not, on the contrary, the plain enumeration of the doctrine common to *all* the English schools? Had a Conference of the Bishops been summoned to give an answer to Luther instead of the King, would its voice have differed, otherwise than in style (if in that) from the book of the royal author, himself an accomplished theologian? The Church of England had no quarrel with the Church of Rome. She did not look upon the jurisdiction of the Pope as an usurpation, but taught his supremacy in the very words of the definition of the Council of Florence—as an Article of revealed Faith. Her enemy in past ages, against which her Bishops had often appealed to Rome, was the usurping Civil Power. The more holy her bishops, the bolder their appeal to Rome. The English Church counted among her saints and martyrs, those of her children who had suffered for their fidelity to Rome, and no saints were more popular with the people, for the Church's cause was their cause.

The enemies of the Church had been at times the King, and always a godless, licentious, and arrogant party among the nobility. These were by their nature opposed to Rome, though none had yet dared to deny the Pope's supreme spiritual power. A bad King, however, might count on these bad nobles, in any quarrel he might have with the Pope. The crash came. Lord Campbell puts it well: "In the . . . year 1534 Henry, finding that there was no chance of succeeding with his divorce suit with the sanction of the Pope, *and being impatient to marry Ann Boleyn*, resolved to break with Rome altogether, and . . . to vest in himself the jurisdic-

tion which the Pope had hitherto exercised in England." Henry defied the Pope, and bade the Convocation of Bishops do likewise. Did they gladly, freely seize upon this opportunity for asserting their independence, and for ridding their Church of popish errors? Nothing of the kind. Grudgingly, unwillingly, bit by bit, in fear and terror, with humiliating and disgraceful cowardice and equivocation they bent to the storm. Fisher, the one only saint among them, suffered martyrdom, rather than follow his craven brethren in their shameful apostasy. The rest were men, Catholic for the most part in belief, but not holy; they were unmortified, loving their ease, their luxuries, their great riches; trembling, with the craven fear of those who lead voluptuous lives, before the wrath of a King, whose wrath the bravest could hardly bear unmoved.

These unsaintly men preferred riches, honors, and luxury with apostasy, to ruin, prison, and probably a cruel death with honor. But dare we, in the face of history, say that they *approved* of this breach with Rome, and with all the ancient glories of their order? Is there the slightest doubt, that in their hearts and consciences, they accepted the arguments which the martyr Fisher made in his noble speech to Convocation? And, moreover: this breach once consummated, did they gladly, freely, continue the work of destruction and of so-called reformation? Did they desire to see the sacred language of the Church changed for the vulgar tongue, the Missal and Breviary give place under Edward VI. to the "Book of Common Prayer"? History is there to prove that, if they were cowards, they did not descend to this abject folly. That work was done by those new creatures of the King, Littledale's "utterly unredeemed villains"—Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and Hooper—men who, before the breach with Rome, would never have been raised to the episcopate, and who, by the wave of a Catholic reformation, would have been swept, with the other unworthy clerics of the time, into that disgrace which their crimes merited. The old bishops looked on, or tried at least to delay the foul work. Many in their old age, obtained grace enough to make a partial stand under Edward VI., and

to suffer deposition and imprisonment. At length, when Mary once more gave them liberty, they joyfully cast off the cursed yoke forever, and, chastened by past misfortunes, remained true to the Old Faith, being ready, under Elizabeth, to suffer imprisonment and exile rather than yield again.

Where, then, is this continuous English Church, whose orthodoxy the world is now asked to acknowledge? What has the present Anglican Establishment, raised on the ruins Elizabeth made of the Church she found standing, in common with the old Provinces of Canterbury and York, Provinces—in communion of faith and discipline with the Catholic world? All the Catholic Church asks of Anglicans and Anglo-Ritualists to-day, is to accept that faith, which the entire Church of England held before Henry VIII., together with those salutary reforms in discipline, inaugurated by the Council of Trent, and which would have been hailed with joy, by every good man then in England. Such are substantially the facts of the relation of Henry VIII. to the Anglican Church, as they are so clearly put by Father Richardson in *What are the Roman Catholic Claims?* What the Vicar's "scholars" and Bishop Kingdon ought to set themselves to prove is, that this Royal Supremacy in Spirituals, fished up out of the depths of Boleyn's lascivious eyes, is compatible, either with historic facts before the time of Henry, or with the Christian faith in itself, or with reason as the general guide of human things; that our Divine Saviour has made promises to be with it and with the Bishops who are created by it; and that He has promised in general to be with Bishops who allege that they make a portion of the Church, though not in communion with the rest of it, even as they themselves conceive it, and who besides receive their spiritual jurisdiction from a King or a Queen.

While the Bishop, the Vicar, and his "scholars" are working out their little exercise, let me help them with a few reflections on Dante—the mightiest poetic genius that ever walked this earth. By what fatuity was the Vicar led to cite him against me in this controversy! It is very evident he never read the *Divine Comedy*, but was supplied by somebody

with the "scraps." This "sublime Apocalypse" has been well described as—"the *Summa* of the Angelic Doctor set before us in raptures of Divinest love and ecstasies of Divinest poetry." The Vicar, referring to it, says:

"The Roman Catholic poet Dante is very plain-spoken about the Popes."

"Very plain-spoken," surely. Let us glance at the poet's idea of the Papacy as he embodies it in the titles of honor which he bestows upon the Pope. According to Dante the Pope is the High Priest, the Shepherd and Guide of the flock, the Spouse of the Church, who is his Bride, and his chair is at Rome. He is the Vicar of Christ, the Head of the World, the Father of Fathers, to whom all owe reverence, even the Emperor himself, as the first-born son to his father; "the Chief Pontiff, Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ and successor of St. Peter, to whom we owe, not indeed all that we owe to Christ, but all that we owe to Peter." Therefore the Papacy is the highest and holiest dignity, the "robe of sovereignty"; and to renounce the Papacy is "the great renunciation." To the Pope is committed the power of the keys; he holds "the keys of glory" assigned by Christ to Peter, "within whose mighty grasp our Lord did leave the keys." To him also it belongs to feed the sheep and the lambs. (See Hettinger's *Divina Commedia*.)

This is "very plain-spoken," I admit, and I have no doubt the illustrious Pius IX. had them in his mind, when in 1857 he placed a wreath on the tomb of Dante at Ravenna, as a witness to his Catholic loyalty and faith. I have no doubt, too, that Leo XIII., now gloriously reigning knows all about them, since it is said that no matter where a quotation is started in the *Divine Comedy*, he can take it up and continue it to the end of the poem—*memoriter*.

But the Vicar's meditations on the Royal Supremacy are disturbed by such plain speaking, and in his agony he cries out that Dante puts Pope Celestine V. in Hell:

"And saw of him the shade whom cowardice base
Led, through his great refusal, to disgrace.

Forthwith I deemed, and felt assured was true,
 That this the crew of poltroons base must be
 Whom God doth hate, and whom his enemies flee."

Now, in the first place, it is not clear who is meant here, and no name is given. Lombardi, a learned Dantean commentator, maintains, in view of the context, which indicates a familiar acquaintance with the person alluded to, that Dante's allusion here is a political and local one, that he had in his mind some one of his fellow citizens whose position and fortune could have saved the imperialistic party from its reverses, and by whom these valuable aids were, through avarice or lack of public spirit, or craven fear, refused. Dean Church, an Anglican Dantean scholar, expresses the same opinion, while Dean Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. vi., p. 194, thinks that Dante points to St. Celestine the Fifth.

But granting, for argument's sake, that Pope Celestine is meant, what are the undisputed facts of history? These facts show that the saint and pontiff was a man of extraordinary piety, a monk of the Benedictine order, a hermit, and the author of several religious treatises. They further show that against his earnest protest, he was elected to the pontificate in a very troubled time, and when he was of the advanced age of seventy-two. "The news of his election," says Darras, *History of the Church*, vol. iii., p. 414, "drew from him tears of grief. . . . While he gave himself up to the sweets of prayer and contemplation, in a cell which he had built in the midst of his palace, the government of the Church was in a state of confusion. . . . Men of judgment complained of such a state of things; their complaints reached the ears of the Pope. He had accepted the onerous charge only to avoid a seeming opposition to the will of God. In these complaints he heard the expression of the same divine will, warning him to cast down a burden too heavy for his weak shoulders. On the 13th of December, 1294, the holy Pope convoked the cardinals in a solemn consistory. He appeared before them in full pontificals, and read aloud his resignation of the papal dignity. Then stripping off all the pontifical vestments, he once more put on the modest habit of the hermit, and took leave of the assem-

bled dignitaries, who followed him in tears, recommending to his prayers the now widowed Church."

Such are the facts of history. Do they justify Dante in saying that they describe "a poltroon," one "disgraced by base cowardice"? Do they not rather describe a man controlled by sincere piety, by a lofty sense of duty? He was clearly within his rights in resigning, and the disinterestedness of his conduct is praised by Petrarch as the act rather of an angel than of a man. Yet, solely for this act, Dante classes him among the reprobates, with the sluggards and base minded souls (See Wilstach's *Dante's Divine Comedy*).

Again the Vicar states that Dante

"Sees Pope Anastatius in hell on account of his following the heresy of Photinus."

Well, as the "good Homer sometimes nods," so does the learned Dante fall into historical mistakes—the result of haste, or of insufficient revision. The poet erred here in accepting the authority of Martin the Pole, Gratian, and others, who asserted that Pope Anastatius restored the Eutychean, Acacius, and communicated with the Acacian, Photinus. For it is now certain, according to the testimony of Evazrius (b. iii., c. xxiii.), Nicephorus (b. xv., c. 17), and Liberatus ("Nestorian Cause," c. 18), that Acacius died before the election of Pope Anastatius the Second; and that Martin the Pole, etc., confounded the Pope with the emperor of the same name, who favored Acacius, and was killed by lightning.

Again the Vicar says that Dante

"Presents a terrible picture of Pope Nicholas III. in hell for simony—head downwards in a flaming pit."

Here again the question is one of history, not of doctrine, for Dante was as genuine a *Papist* as I am. Pope Nicholas the Third assumed the Pontificate in 1227. The Anglican Dean Milman, *Latin Christianity*, book xi., c. iv., says of him:

"At length the election fell on John Gaetano, of the noble Roman house, the Orsini, a man of remarkable beauty of person and demeanor. His name, 'The Accomplished,' implied that in

him met all the graces of the handsomest clerks in the world, but he was a man likewise of irreproachable morals, of vast ambition, and of great ability."

During the three years of his Pontificate, he compelled both the Emperor Rudolph and Charles of Anjou to abandon their claims on the Holy See, labored strenuously and with success for the reunion of the Greeks, and was the special protector of the Franciscan order. Yet Dante condemns him to hell, on what Döllinger (*History of the Church*, vol. iv., p. 75), calls "the unproved and improbable accusation of simony." But notwithstanding the poet's severity to the *man*, he does not forget his profound reverence for and loyalty to the Papacy, for he thus addresses Nicholas :

" And, were it not that reverence yet me awes
For the Great Keys which in the glad life came
Into thine hands, unworthy of the same,
I should use heavier words of blame."

Wilstach, canto xix., 100.

This is a tempting subject to me, but I must stay my hand. To Dante Christ Himself was the Prototype of the Church and of her visible life; judging all things, therefore, by the standard of His Divine Ideal, he felt keenly the contrast between the exemplar and the copy (*Paradiso*, xxviii., 55), like an artist "whose trembling hand cannot perfection's ultimate point command" (*Paradiso*, xiii., 77) and how the "brightness of the seal" is dimmed and tarnished by human frailty. Hence his severe treatment of certain Popes is a defense of the Papacy itself, since it is the very dignity of their office which makes any fault in a Pope so conspicuous. The great poet was human and therefore liable to err. His errors have long since passed into oblivion, but his sublime work belongs to mankind for all time. As long as one human heart beats with love for the sacred things of human nature—Freedom, Wisdom, Faith, so long will the name of the author of the *Divine Commedia* be loved and revered.

Let me commend to my opponents Dante's words on the teaching authority of the Church :

“ Christians! be ye to principles more true;
 Not by each wind be ye like feathers blown,
 Nor deem that every fount doth merits own,
 Ye have the Testaments, the Old and New,
 Ye have the Pastor of the Church your guide;
 Let them for your eternal needs provide.”
 Wilstach, *Paradiso*, canto v., 73.

TWENTY-SECOND LETTER.—For confusion and chaos this takes the prize. More arrant rubbish has not been penned since the world began. Probably it is just as well that not a Protestant who read it understood what the writer was talking about. I assure them they have lost nothing. A few years ago the Ritualists got hold of the word “Jurisdiction,” and, like the witch on the broomstick, they have been riding it ever since—trying to reach the moon. For present purposes I have sufficiently disposed of this letter in my comments on the last. To readers who desire to go more thoroughly into the farce being played by Ritualists, I recommend the following very recent works:

“Authority, or a Plain Reason for Joining the Church of Rome,” by Father Rivington; “Roman Catholic Claims,” by Rev. Charles Gore; “What are the Roman Catholic Claims?” by Father Richardson; “Dependence, or the Insecurity of the Anglican Position,” by Father Rivington. Fathers Richardson and Rivington are both learned converts to the Catholic Church, while Mr. Gore is Pusey’s theological heir, and Principal of Pusey House, Oxford. He was selected as principal to carry out Pusey’s theological views in all respects, but he has recently appeared in the book entitled *Lux Mundi*, with an essay which goes right to the heart of Pusey’s convictions as to the Old Testament. The veteran Archdeacon Dennison has fulminated an assault on the book under the title of “The Political Heresy and the Intellectual Heresy of Century XIX. in England.” And the end is not yet. What a happy family, theologically speaking, are Anglicans, Anglo-ritualists, *et hoc omne genus!*

TWENTY-THIRD AND LAST LETTER.—This is the saddest letter of the batch. Between the lines, you can hear the wails

that accompany the apologies and the humiliating confessions of regrets over unfulfilled promises "to smash" me. Milton describes the fallen angels as lying in a "lake of marl" with no rest for their uneasy limbs. I wonder to what extent their good intentions simply were a factor in their agony. At this stage of the controversy I would fain be generous with my opponent, and assure him that in the next world there are happily more paths than one paved with good resolutions, but his turpitude, made manifest now even to his own dull apprehension, absolutely prohibits me. Let me explain.

In the last paragraph of his first letter in this discussion (third preliminary in this volume) the Vicar says:

"It ought to be remembered, in this connection, that the Church of England has preserved her balance well under the circumstances, and observes four feasts yearly in honor of the Holy Mother."

In the last letter of my *Résumé* I charged him with suppressing a *fifth* feast marked in the English Church Calendar—that of the "Conception of the Virgin Mary," on the 8th of December; and I demanded that he give the public the reason. He wrote his first *Strictures* in reply to the *Résumé*, but said not a word in explanation of his ignorance or dishonesty. We hear from him now only because he thinks it "advisable," he says, to notice my charge.

"Advisable," indeed! Is not this the language of the very sneak-thief when caught plying his trade? He, too, thinks it "advisable" to restore the stolen property. Was the Vicar afraid that an earlier and more candid acknowledgment of his sin might disturb the "balance" which his Church was able to preserve so well—with only *four* feasts on her hands? Now watch his tactics. He says:

"At the opening of the controversy I inadvertently alluded to 'four' instead of 'five' feasts of the Blessed Virgin commemorated in the English Church. My opponent . . . takes it for granted that the commemoration I suppressed was that of the 'Conception of the Virgin.'"

"Takes it for granted." Why not? Has he dared to deny it? Of course not. But he does not hesitate to lie about it.

"I inadvertently alluded to four feasts instead of five," he says. "Inadvertently!" Will any reader of these letters believe him? Not one. The simple fact is, that he either did not know that the feast was in the Calendar, or that he did not know what to do with it, and therefore suppressed it. The latter I will prove to be the true view. Now, mark, he says:

"I need scarcely observe to studious churchmen that the Black Letter day entered on our Calendar as the 'Conception of the B. V. Mary' is the equivalent of what the Eastern Church commemorates under the more accurate title of 'the Conception of Anna,' and is intended like that minor feast to direct attention to 'the remote dawnings of our salvation,' as an Archbishop of Canterbury of the 14th century puts it, and to provide a more distant hailing of the Incarnation of the Son of God than the Feast of the Annunciation supplies."

Note the pathetically cunning appeal to "studious churchmen"—the rank and file of the laity, he confesses, are not supposed to know anything about this *fifth* feast, and they do not. Small blame that even "studious churchmen" know little about it, since the Vicar himself either "inadvertently" suppressed it, or was ignorant of its existence. It is a "Black Letter day," you know. What contemptible knavery!

He informs the "studious churchmen" that the feast of the "Conception of the B. V. Mary" is the equivalent of the feast of the "Conception of Anna," which, he says, is a "minor feast." Could the humblest intelligence in the Salvation Army ranks display greater ignorance and stupidity! A "minor feast," indeed. Why, they are one and the same thing, and absolutely identical. Hear Father Perrone:

"The Feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin obtained among the Greeks and Orientals from the earliest times. For as early as the fifth century we come across traces of the institution of this Feast. In the *Typicon* of S. Sabas (who flourished in A.D. 484), or in the order for reciting the office throughout the year on Dec. 9, it is marked down '*The Conception* (active, i.e.) *of S. Anne, Mother of the Deipara.*' Similarly in the seventh century mention is made of the same Feast by S. Andrew of Creto, who in the ecclesiastical Hours and Triodion, on Dec. 9, thus announces the Feast of the Conception: *On Dec. 9, the Conception of the Holy Anne, Mother of the Mother of God.*' And in the first Ode he

writes: '*We to-day celebrate, O Holy Anne, your conceiving; in that, freed from the bonds of sterility, you conceived Her in your womb, who was able to contain the Uncontainable.*'"

But Pusey told him the same thing, *Eirenicon*, vol. ii., p. 353: "The Festival was at once the 'Conception of S. Anne; and the 'Conception of the Blessed Deipara.' This is the Oxford genius who boasted that he had to teach me to read my own authorities. This quotation was directly before his eyes in Pusey's pages, yet he dares to instruct "studious churchmen" that the feasts are different. When the blind thus leads the blind, we know what happens.

Remember I am here considering simply the feast of the "Conception of the B. V. Mary" as it appears in the Anglican Calendar, and without any reference whatever to its immaculateness. How did the feast get into this Calendar? As we have seen from Father Perrone, the Festival of the Conception was celebrated at an early period in the Oriental Church. The earliest records call it either the Conception of St. Anne or the Conception of the Blessed Virgin. But while in the Western Church the Feast has been always celebrated on the eighth, in the East it was first observed on the ninth of December. After the great St. Anselm had been made Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year 1093, he established the Feast of the Conception in his province, St. Bernard being then a boy of eighteen.

In 1328 a Council was held in London by Simon Mepham, Archbishop of Canterbury. The result of its deliberations was the Constitution of seven Chapters or Canons, the second of which runs as follows:

"Moreover, because among all the saints, the memory of the most blessed Virgin and Mother of the Lord is by so much more frequently and solemnly observed, by how much she is believed to have found greater favor with God, who ordained her predestined conception for the temporal origin of His only Begotten, and of Him who is the salvation of all; in order that by these means, the beginning, though remote, of our salvation (in which matter for spiritual joy occurs to the mind) may increase devotion in all;—and following in the footsteps of our predecessor, the venerable Anselm, who thought it fitting, besides her other more ancient solemnities, to add

the worthy solemnity of her conception;—we appoint and command under strict obligation, that for the future the Feast of the afore-said Conception be festively and solemnly celebrated in all the churches of our Province of Canterbury.”

Now I have often pointed out that devotion to Mary grows out of the Incarnation, as does the Church herself, and that it tends to keep alive faith in that crowning act of the Creator’s love for us. This is admitted by the Anglican *Union Review*, in these words:

“It is also true and deserves consideration, that there has been hitherto no marked tendency to heresy on the subject of the Incarnation among Roman Catholics, while, where the dignity of the Blessed Virgin has been underrated, heresies have speedily crept in.”

Can your readers imagine the present incumbent of the See of Canterbury, or the late Archbishop Tait, who lived and died a Presbyterian at heart, issuing a decree such as that of their Catholic predecessor, Archbishop Mepham, every word of which is a *Te Deum* in honor of the Incarnation? O, no. Yet the Vicar instructs “studious Churchmen,” that Archbishop Mepham intended, by the observance of the Feast of the Conception, to direct attention to the “remote dawns of our salvation,” and to provide a more distant hailing of the Incarnation of the Son of God than the Feast of the Annunciation supplies. That is precisely what this Catholic Archbishop intended. What an appalling confession on the significance of a feast so gloriously celebrated to-day throughout the Catholic world, but which is not even alluded to in the Book of Common Prayer, which the Vicar “inadvertently” suppressed from the calendar, which is never mentioned in Anglican Church or “Mission Chapel” now, and which has never before been heard of by Anglicans—“studious” or otherwise—in this Province. Good heaven! And they will dare assert, that the Anglican Apostasy of to-day—the bastard progeny of Henry’s last, cradled by the “utterly unredeemed and villainous” *accoucheurs*, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Scory & Co.—is the direct descendant and heir of the great Catholic Church of pre-Reformation times! Shades of the blessed martyrs

Fisher and More—forgive them! The saintly Catholic Bishop, and the illustrious Catholic lawyer—the Law and the Prophets—once more stand together to witness to God and His Christ. Hallowed be their sacred memory!

Here again I catch the Vicar in a bare-faced falsehood. He says:

“Even Bellarmine admits that *nothing more than this* was intended by the originators of the feast.”

One would suppose that having put the great Cardinal in the “burning lake” as a liar, the Vicar could afford to be just to him. This is a mistake. He deliberately lies about him, with the evidence of his falsehood staring him in the face in Pusey’s pages, *Eirenicon*, vol. 2, p. 380, from which he got Bellarmine’s name. Pusey says:

“Bellarmine, who piously believed in the Immaculate Conception, still asserts that it was ‘not the *chief* foundation of the festival’ of the ‘Conception of the B. V. Mary.’”

Here are Bellarmine’s words in full:

“The chief foundation of this festival is not the Immaculate Conception of her who was to be the Mother of God. For whatsoever that conception may have been, from the very fact that it was the conception of the Mother of God, the memory of it bringeth singular joy to the world. For then first had we the certain pledge of redemption, especially since, not without a miracle, was she conceived of a barren mother. So then they too, who believe that the Virgin was conceived in sin, celebrate this festival.”

The Vicar, with these words before him, makes Bellarmine say, that a belief in the Immaculate Conception had nothing whatever to do with the festival! Is not this monstrous? Is there no difference, let me ask, between one thing’s being the chief foundation of another, and the same thing’s forming no part of the foundation? Does not Bellarmine expressly assert, that the belief in the Immaculate Conception was the foundation of the Feast of the Conception in the minds, at least, of those who accepted that truth? To the extent, then, that the Immaculate Conception was received throughout the Church, to the same extent was it considered the foundation of the

Feast of the Conception in England and elsewhere. But why need I argue the matter, when I have Bellarmine's own explanation of himself, in a note on the same page of the *Eirenicon*. Bellarmine says :

"There is a great difference between the Mother of God and His forerunner, and between the conception of each. *For since the greater part of the Church piously believe the Immaculate Conception, the same Church had an occasion for instituting this festival*, which occasion it had not to institute a festival on the conception of John Baptist."

Need I make a single remark upon this? Is there any doubt in Bellarmine's mind about the connection between the belief in the Immaculate Conception and the institution of the Feast of the Conception? Of course not. Pusey, fairly enough, gives this quotation with the other. He proceeds to remark upon it, too, in a way that witnesses once more to the bewildering muddle into which even this learned man could fall when he attempted to handle Catholic theology. In the matter under discussion, however, he honestly stated enough of the truth to enable the Vicar to avoid a bath in the "burning lake." But he will not be saved—even from himself, for no sooner do I exorcise one unclean spirit of falsehood and calumny, than he forthwith returns with a dozen others of the same kidney, but more vile and wicked.

One word more right here. Anent my charge that he suppressed the fact of the existence of the Feast of the "Conception of the Virgin Mary" in the Anglican Calendar, the Vicar says :

"I can only suppose he wishes your readers to believe that the revisers of the English Prayer Book accepted the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin."

What fatuity led this unfortunate man to draw attention to the history of the English Book of Common Prayer? I know it well. Permit me just a word upon it, in answer to the Vicar's insinuation.

After the Feast of Pentecost in 1549, the use of the book, as it came from the hands of the committee of Convocation

originally appointed with the sanction of Henry VIII., became obligatory, by Act of Parliament, on all ministers of the Anglican Establishment. Scarcely had it been launched, when it met violent opposition from the more radical school of reformers, headed by Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, and several continental Protestant adventurers. Among these were the notorious Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, and John à Lasco, who had come to England after the accession of Edward VI., and made their way to important posts. Calvin, too, urged upon the Protector Somerset the necessity of pushing the Reformation in England further than it had gone. The result was that Edward VI., the "young tiger-cub," as Littledale calls him, declared himself in favor of a more thorough revision of the Prayer Book. The infamous Cranmer, then Archbishop of Canterbury, one of the framers of the first book, gave his consent, and another committee of divines, the same assumedly who prepared the ordinal of 1550, undertook the preparation of a second book, which was duly ratified by Parliament, and came into use on All Saints' day, 1552. This is substantially the "Book of Common Prayer" in use to-day. Your readers have seen under whose inspiration the work was done. The Anglican *Church News* asserts, that some of the revisers—"Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Jewell—were apostates, traitors, perjurers, robbers, and persecutors"; and Littledale, that they were "utterly unredeemed villains."

Now, God forbid! that I should, even in thought, associate such miscreants with either the Incarnation, or its "distant hailing" and "certain pledge"—the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of the Incarnate. They cared as little for the one as for the other. But I do fearlessly assert, in the face of the Anglican Episcopate in this Dominion, its Deans, Canons, and Vicars, that the illustrious predecessors of Cranmer in the See of Canterbury—St. Anselm, who established the Feast of the Conception in that See, and Simon Mephram, who obligated its festive and solemn celebration—did accept the glorious doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Christ's all-holy Mother, and in testimony of their belief did inscribe that feast in the calendar of the Catholic Church in England, where it is

triumphantly celebrated to-day—the Book of Common Prayer, its apostate revisers, and “black-letter” calendar to the contrary notwithstanding.

But how do I explain the fact, that such men as these Protestant revisers were, adopted and continued in their Protestant calendar this feast introduced into England by Catholic Archbishops? My explanation is this: Their outraged consciences had made such cowards of them, that they were afraid to expunge from their country’s religious record this evidence of her early love of the Woman, who had been the Ark and Tabernacle of the Incarnation, and whose “predestined Conception,” in the words of Archbishop Mepham, “God had ordained for the temporal origin of His only Begotten, and of Him who is the salvation of all.” So the feast stands in the Protestant calendar, a gaunt and awful spectre, a “black letter day,” to be observed upon by Ritualistic Vicars for “studious Churchmen” as the fossil remains of a belief long since extinct. The Anglo-Ritualist *Union Review* connects the fact with its philosophy in these words:

“A great deal of the shrinking felt by Anglicans from giving our Lady due honor, arises from the lingering effects of heretical teaching, or unconsciously heretical belief, on the mystery of the Incarnation. Nestorianism prevails to a very great extent among English Churchmen, and its withering effects are very difficult to shake off, even by those who have long become orthodox in their theoretical creed.”

I come now to the Vicar’s remarks on St. Bernard touching the observance of the Feast of the Conception. He says:

“S. Bernard, however, clearly detected the dangerous tendencies of such a festival in his day, excessive though his own devotions were to the Virgin, and he sharply reproved the Canons of Lyons for the unwarrantable grounds on which they admitted and supported it.”

There is scarcely a word of truth here—in the Vicar’s sense. Though the festival in question had been established from an early period in the East, as we have seen from Father Perrone, in Spain in the seventh, in Naples in the ninth, and in Eng-

land in the eleventh century, yet it had not been instituted in Rome. In the days of St. Bernard, the Church of Lyons, in France, influenced by the example of other particular churches which had done the same, adopted in its turn the custom of celebrating the Feast of the Conception. Whereupon the saint addressed a letter to the Canons of that Church, in which he reprovèd them for taking the step upon their own authority, and before they had consulted the Holy See. The whole scope of the letter, now before me, is to discountenance the introduction of the feast into their church without the knowledge and authority of Rome. Here are St. Bernard's words, in justification of the reprimand :

“For, if it thus seemed proper, the matter should have been first referred to the authority of the Apostolic See, and not to act thus rashly and unadvisedly on the simple notions of a few unlearned persons.”

It is true, nevertheless, that St. Bernard discusses the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception by way of *obiter dictum*, as the Vicar would say, and appears to argue against it. But does he assail what the Catholic Church to-day understands by the Immaculate Conception ? I most emphatically assure your Protestant readers that he does not. His argument is directed against an idea upon which the Church is silent, and which she does not at all contemplate in the mystery. This, too, Pusey discovered in the case of St. Thomas, and candidly confessed in a letter now before me. The Vicar says that St. Bernard's “devotions to the Virgin were excessive.” “St. Bernard was a very pious soul, but altogether unreliable,” chimes in Bishop Kingdon. What insolent impertinence. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has since been defined by that very “Apostolic See” to which this great saint and Father of the Church referred the Canons of Lyons. What would be his own attitude and conduct now, your readers can form an accurate judgment from the concluding words of his famous letter. Here are his words :

“But what I have said I have certainly said without prejudice to what may be more soundly thought by one more wise. I reserve all this, and everything else of the kind, for the examination and

judgment especially of the Roman Church, and if I think in anything differently, I am prepared to be amended by its judgment."

Throughout this controversy, I have not discussed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; it came up but incidentally. In bringing it to a conclusion, however, I think it will be acceptable to intelligent and thoughtful Protestants if I state just what the doctrine is, and, at the same time, offer for their reflection a few thoughts in connection with it.

On the 8th of December, 1854, Pius IX., of immortal memory, in presence of a vast concourse of Catholic bishops who thronged the Basilica of St. Peter, solemnly defined the Immaculate Conception of Mary to be a dogma of Faith, in the following words:

"In honor of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity, for the glory and ornament of the Virgin Mother of God, for the exaltation of the Catholic Faith and the spread of the Christian religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our Own, we pronounce and define that the doctrine, which maintains that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary in the first moment of her Conception, was, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in regard of the merits of Christ Jesus the Saviour of the human race, preserved free from the stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and is therefore to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful."

I am aware, of course, that there are grave theological ideas involved in this definition, which are not familiar to Protestants. They were not familiar even to so learned a man as Pusey. I will therefore lay before them a short commentary upon it from Cardinal Newman's letter to Pusey, on the occasion of his *Eirenicon*. The Cardinal addressed his old and beloved friend in these words:

"It is indeed to me a most strange phenomenon that so many learned and devout men stumble at this doctrine; and I can only account for it by supposing that in matter of fact they do not know what we mean by the Immaculate Conception; and your volume (may I say it?) bears out my suspicion. It is a great consolation to have reason for thinking so,—reason for believing that in some sort the persons in question are in the position of those great saints in former times, who are said to have hesitated about the doctrine,

when they would not have hesitated at all, if the word 'Conception' had been clearly explained in that sense in which now it is universally received. I do not see how any one who holds with (the Anglican Bishop) Bull the Catholic doctrine of the supernatural endowments of our first parents, has fair reason for doubting our doctrine about the Blessed Virgin. It has no reference whatever to her parents, but simply to her own person; it does but affirm that, together with the nature which she inherited from her parents, that is, her own nature, she had a superadded fulness of grace, and that from the first moment of her existence. Suppose Eve had stood the trial, and not lost her first grace; and suppose she had eventually had children, those children from the first moment of their existence would, through divine bounty, have received the same privilege that she had ever had; that is, as she was taken from Adam's side, in a garment, so to say, of grace, so they in turn would have received what may be called an immaculate conception. They would have then been conceived in grace, as in fact they are conceived in sin. What is there difficult in this doctrine? What is there unnatural? Mary may be called, as it were, a daughter of Eve unfallen. You believe with us that St. John Baptist had grace given to him three months before his birth, at the time that the Blessed Virgin visited his mother. He accordingly was *not* immaculately conceived, because he was alive before grace came to him; but our Lady's case only differs from his in this respect, that to her the grace of God came, not three months merely before her birth, but from the first moment of her being, as it had been given to Eve.

"But it may be said, How does this enable us to say that she was conceived without *original sin*? If Anglicans knew what we mean by original sin, they would not ask the question. Our doctrine of original sin is not the same as the Protestant doctrine. 'Original Sin,' with us, cannot be called sin, in the mere ordinary sense of the word 'sin'; it is a term denoting Adam's sin as transferred to us, or the state to which Adam's sin reduces his children; but by Protestants it seems to be understood as sin, in much the same sense as actual sin. We, with the Fathers, think of it as something negative, Protestants as something positive. Protestants hold that it is a disease, a radical change of nature, an active poison internally corrupting the soul, infecting its primary elements, and disorganizing it; and they fancy that we ascribe a different nature from ours to the Blessed Virgin, different from that of her parents, and from that of fallen Adam. We hold nothing of the kind; we consider that in Adam she died, as others; that she was included, together with the whole race, in Adam's sentence; that she incurred his

debt, as we do; but that for the sake of Him who was to redeem her and us upon the Cross, to her the debt was remitted by anticipation; on her the sentence was not carried out, except indeed as regards her natural death, for she died when her time came, as others. All this we teach, but we deny that she had original sin; for by original sin we mean, as I have already said, something negative, viz., this only, the *deprivation* of that supernatural, unmerited grace which Adam and Eve had on their first formation,—deprivation and the consequences of deprivation. Mary could not merit, any more than they, the restoration of that grace; but it was restored to her by God's free bounty, from the very first moment of her existence, and thereby, in fact, she never came under the original curse, which consisted in the loss of it. And she had this special privilege, in order to fit her to become the Mother of her and our Redeemer, to fit her mentally, spiritually for it; so that, by the aid of the first grace, she might so grow in grace, that, when the Angel came and her Lord was at hand, she might be 'full of grace,' prepared, as far as a creature could be prepared, to receive Him into her bosom."

The marvellous effect of this exquisite exposition on Pusey's mind, your interested readers can easily ascertain by looking over the second volume of the *Eirenicon*. I have already referred to it, somewhat at length, in my *Rejoinder*. On the subject of original sin Pusey speaks out very strongly. He confesses the ignorance of his own people—"our people," he says—repudiates the doctrine of Luther and Calvin, and heartily proclaims his acceptance of the Catholic truth as taught by the Council of Trent. But he goes farther, and claims that the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles "virtually agrees with that of the Council of Trent." Would to God that a consensus of opinion to this effect could be brought about among "studious churchmen," bishops, and vicars. We would then be nigh to the beginning of the end of the Anglican apostasy as well upon the Immaculate Conception, as upon other truths of Christianity. But what, unfortunately, are the facts against which the Catholic-minded Pusey so strenuously fought? The Vicar introduced Döllinger to your readers as "the learned Church historian and theologian." But Döllinger affirms that "the Thirty-nine Articles are essentially Calvinistic,"—a fact the world knows, Pusey's efforts to minimize its truth to the

contrary notwithstanding. The repulsive coloring, therefore, which Calvin's heresy has given to the notion of original sin, and to other parts of the Christian revelation intimately connected with it, has become the very web and woof, so to speak, of Anglican theology—such as it is. It is only this infamous monstrosity and caricature of Christianity that throws any serious obstacle in the way of an acceptance of the Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Christ's Blessed Mother by "studious churchmen." But this is not all the mischief that Calvin's offspring has done. For it has predisposed a multitude of thoughtful inquirers against the Divine authority of the Gospel altogether. Reason revolts against the horrible assertion, that the great Father of the Universe should, because of the sin of one of His creatures, create millions upon millions of intelligent beings in a state of essential deformity and unnatural proclivity to evil; to say nothing of the philosophical impossibilities which beset such a theory. And when an anomaly so monstrous is authoritatively identified with the Christian faith, it is no wonder that private judgment should adopt the only alternative which seems open to it, and unhesitatingly reject a religious system that offends against the first principles of its moral sense. The London *Spectator* (June, 1890,) now states the result: "*The decay of religion in England is general. Formerly, such religion as Englishmen had was intimately associated with Protestantism; and as the latter has declined, it has been replaced by a state of feeling which, whatever be its other advantages, is near of kin to indifference to truth*"—quoted in the London *Tablet*, June 21st, 1890. In this our day, I know of no triumph, on theological lines, more simply glorious for the Catholic Church than the movement for the Revision of the Calvinistic Creed of the famous Westminster Confession of Faith. This exposition of Christianity contradicts the dictates of Reason, shocks the convictions of Conscience, and is subversive of all Human Dignity. "Let us be honest, and confess," writes Dr. Schaff, "that old Calvinism is fast dying out." May God hasten the day of its utter extinction! I commend to your theological readers the following recent literature on this topic, *pro* and *con*: Dr.

Schaff's *Creed Revision*; Dr. Briggs' *Whither?*; and Dr. McCosh's *Whither? O Whither? Tell me Where?* a consideration of Dr. Briggs' pamphlet.

Some of your readers may ask: But was the Immaculate Conception not unknown to the early ages of the Church's life? I say—No, not unknown simply, unless it may be said that the Incarnation itself was unknown to the first centuries, and even the being of God. How many Saints have used expressions concerning our Incarnate Lord, which seemed to deny one or other aspect of the mystery of His Incarnation, and which, indeed, would have been a denial of the truth after the truth had been defined! How often they used language which was harmless in them, but being misused by others was laid aside! What strange expressions they used even of the Immensity of God! So that, as (the Anglican) Bishop Bull reminds us, they might even be convicted of having erred on that fundamental truth. And so, although in those early times they had not sifted the meaning of their own expressions nor drawn out in careful phrase their inmost thoughts concerning her, whom they called the Second Eve, they cannot be said to have been strangers to the truth of her Immaculate Conception.

It took ages to settle the exact equivalent of those high thoughts which they had concerning her, so that expressions may be culled from the language of nineteen centuries, which are at least inexact—occasionally contrary to the truth. It was only when at length theologians were in danger of violent difference that the subject was mercifully closed, and by the Divine Assistance the infallible head of the Church decided in what terms the glorious Conception of our Lady should henceforth be enshrined, and unity thus be secured. And not only was unity thus secured, but the Church received fresh light for her growing work. So, beautifully writes Father Rivington, in *Dependence*, etc.

Your readers will admit, I hope, that I have always treated my opponent with *courtesy* and *magnanimity* in the matter of his witnesses. For instance, I have over and over again put in evidence the testimony of Döllinger, Pusey, Littledale, Vercellone and Père Gratry—witnesses called against me. Simply

because the Vicar thought to make out Father Gratry a rebel against the Catholic Church of which he lived and died a devoted son, he canonized him, and introduced him to your readers as the "Saintly Père Gratry." Thanks! He well deserves it, but, if I must play the part of "Devil's Advocate," not for the Vicar's reasons. Now the "saintly Père Gratry" was a "Priest of the Oratory of the Immaculate Conception,"—a society of priests founded by himself for the conversion and instruction of the Parisian youth. Your readers, then, will not be surprised to learn that the "saintly Père" wrote a most beautiful book (now before me) on the Immaculate Conception, in which he looks upon the definition of this dogma by Pius IX. as a most glorious contribution to our knowledge. Your readers will be glad to hear the words of this member of the French Academy, mathematician and philosopher on our doctrine.

The "saintly Père Gratry" writes :

"O Queen, conceived without sin, pray for us! Pray that in these our days the manifestation of this mystery (*i.e.*, of her Immaculate Conception) may become a shining light in thy Church. Pray that this manifestation may be such a progress of Christian wisdom as S. Vincent of Lerins speaks of in the same pages which warn the Christians of his days against dangerous novelties. 'Shall there never be,' St. Vincent exclaims, 'any religious progress in the Church of Christ? Assuredly there shall be very great progress; and who would be so envious of man, so hostile to God as to wish to hinder it? Yes, there shall be progress in the faith, but no change in the faith; let, then, understanding, knowledge, and wisdom grow and develop from age to age, both in the Universal Church and in the individual soul. In the course of time the old doctrines of the heavenly philosophy must be more and more cultivated and explained; they can never be changed, maimed, or mutilated, but they must acquire more clearness, evidence, and precision, while they preserve the fulness, integrity, and propriety that they originally possessed.'"

Père Gratry next quotes from a pious author, whose name he does not give, these words :

"There are many reasons why God willed that the mystery of Mary should dawn by degrees, like the day. . . . One reason, as theologians commonly say, is this : because the Church is not

founded on our Lady, but upon her Son. Therefore it was convenient that God should first make clear the truths of salvation, and afterwards in the superabundance of His goodness should clear up others, which, though of less consequence, yet raise our minds to know him better and to love him more ardently."

And the Vicar's "saint" thus concludes his philosophic reflections:

"The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin is a truth so deep, so fundamental, and so central; it throws so strong a light on all the truths of faith, and even on all the truths of philosophy, that its fuller manifestation will perhaps contribute to bring about that intellectual revolution in the Christian world and in the human mind which clear-sighted souls are looking for."

I have adopted Father Rivington's translation of these extracts: they will give your readers some idea of the enthusiasm with which this "saintly" Christian philosopher greeted the final settlement of the question as to the relation between the first and Second Eve—as the Fathers call Mary.

"The saintly Père Gratry," "the good priests of Portland and the Cathedral," says the Vicar in one breath, while in the next breath he accuses them of being guilty of "extravagances," "enormities," "impious utterances," "impious acts of worship and prayer," "idoltrous devotions," and "idoltrous worship," toward the ever-blessed Mother of his and their Redeemer! The cowardly and insolent hypocrite.

I will now submit to your readers the testimony of two very different witnesses,—the leaders of the two greatest revolts against the Church of God,—Mahomet and Martin Luther. They represent the *sixth* century and the *sixteenth*, and they have received and reflected, each in his peculiar way, the tradition of the Church on the Immaculate Conception.

My references will be to Davenport's edition of Sale's translation of *The Koran*, Philadelphia, 1864, now before me.

It is well known that Mahomet, during the commercial period of his life, conversed with Christians on their doctrines, especially in his visits to the great fair of Bosra, which brought people together from all parts of the East. In various parts of the *Koran* he has inserted fragments of Christian teaching,

colored with his own fancies. And, amongst the Christian traditions which he thus got hold of, was that of the Immaculate Conception. The passage to which I desire to call attention is to be found in the third chapter of the *Koran*, which is entitled, *The Family of Imran*. Imran, or Amran, according to the Mohammedan commentators, is the husband of Anna, and the father of Mary—it is another name for St. Joachim. Here are Mahomet's words :

"God hath surely chosen Adam, and Noah, and the family of Abraham, and the family of Imran, above the *rest of the world*; a race *descending* the one from the other; God is He who heareth and knoweth. Remember, when the wife of Imran (Anna) said, Lord, I have vowed unto thee that which is in my womb, to be dedicated to *thy service*; accept it therefore of me, for thou art He who heareth and knoweth. And when she was delivered of it, she said, Lord, verily I have brought forth a female (and God well knew what she had brought forth), and a male is not as a female (because the latter could not minister in the temple); I have called her Mary, and I commend her to thy protection, and also her issue, against Satan, driven away with stones. Therefore the Lord accepted her with a gracious acceptance, and caused her to bear an excellent offspring."

Your readers will find this passage fully explained by Mohammedan commentators in the notes to Sale's *Koran*. Sale himself sums them up in these words :

"It is not improbable that the pretended Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary is intimated in this passage. For according to a tradition of Mohammed, every person that comes into the world is touched at his birth by the devil, and therefore cries out, Mary and her son only excepted; between whom and the evil spirit God placed a veil, so that his touch did not reach them. And for this reason, they say, neither of them was guilty of any sin, like the rest of the children of Adam. Which peculiar grace they obtained by virtue of this recommendation of them by Hannah to God's protection."

The *Koran* proceeds to say that Mary, under the care of Zacharias, was placed in a chamber of the temple. It then narrates the miraculous birth of St. John the Baptist, whom it calls an honorable, chaste, and righteous prophet, who should bear witness to the word from God. It then adds: "The

Angels said, O Mary, verily God hath chosen thee, and hath purified thee, and hath chosen thee above *all* the women of the world: O Mary, be devout towards thy Lord, and worship and bow down with those that bow down."

Now the respect which Mahomet and his followers have always expressed towards the Blessed Virgin, and which should put many to shame who profess themselves Christians, is the more remarkable when we consider their notions respecting the rest of her sex, opinions as disgraceful as they are degrading, and which tend to show that theoretical opinions concerning Mary are of no avail, unless in those Christian hearts which separate her not from Jesus, and truly honor her as the Mother of God. The "sermon" preached by the Vicar after this discussion had long continued, is a good illustration of such theoretical opinions: it had nothing but words.

In his great work, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, D'Herbelot tells the following anecdote, which illustrates the Mohammedan opinion of Mary.

Abou Ishac, one of the most famous doctors of Mohammedanism, was ambassador from the Caliph, at the court of the Greek Emperor. There he had warm disputes on the subject of religion with the Greek Patriarch and several bishops. The bishops had quoted sundry reflections made by Mohammedans to the disadvantage of Ayesha, the wife and widow of the false prophet. Abou Ishac replied, by drawing a picture of the divisions in the East respecting our Lord's Incarnation; how some said that the Holy Virgin brought forth, some said she did not bring forth, some said they knew not whether she did or not. He then concluded with this appeal to the Bishops: "How can you be surprised that Mohammedans have differed about Ayesha, since Christians have differed about that glorious Virgin Mary, who was a mine and a fountain of purity." See Bishop Ullathorne's beautiful "*Exposition of the Immaculate Conception*."

I will now call attention to a passage in Luther's *Kirchenpostill* (Opera, ed. Walch., Hallæ 1745; xi. 2616), which runs as follows:

"As other men were conceived in sin, both in soul and body, but

Christ without sin, either in body or soul; so Mary the Virgin was conceived according to the body indeed without grace, but according to the soul full of grace. Such is the meaning of these words which the Angel Gabriel spoke to her, '*Blessed art thou amongst women.*' For it could not have been said of her, '*Blessed art thou,*' if she had ever been under the curse. It was also right and just that that person should be preserved without sin, from whom Christ was to take the flesh that should overcome all sin. For that is properly called '*Blessed,*' which is endowed with God's grace, that is, which is without sin. Of this matter others have written more at length, and adduced excellent reasons which it would be too long here to relate."

So wrote Martin Luther in 1527, or ten years after his falling away from the Catholic Church, thus showing how strong and general was the general belief on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in Christendom in the sixteenth century, just as Mohammed's testimony (he was born A.D. 570) shows the same fact for the sixth century.

Three hundred and twenty-seven years after Luther had so clearly and strongly affirmed his belief in the Immaculate Conception, the solemn definition of the doctrine by Pius IX. was greeted with clamors and cries from the enfeebled sects of German Protestantism. Thereupon German Rationalism charged Protestant evangelicalism with its inconsistencies, as exhibited in these outcries against the definition. The German *Protestant Ecclesiastical Gazette*, of December 9th, 1854, remonstrates with it in these words:

"Why all this clamor on the part of orthodox Protestants? This belief is but the necessary and very natural consequence of their own principles, and it is surprising that the definition did not take place sooner, and that orthodox Protestantism had not long since proclaimed it. . . . The roots of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary extend in fact into the very depth of the substance of their own dogmatic system, and show both the weak sides and the corruption of the Evangelical Church. In substance it is a question on the historical fact of the holy and immaculate personality of Jesus Christ. . . . If they are not disposed to revise from top to bottom the theory of original sin, and our orthodox now desire it less than ever, there is no other part to take but to imitate the Catholics, and to deny the influence of original sin on the

human nature of Christ; this will also lead to the liberating of His Mother, that is to the asserting that she was conceived without original stain. This is what the Roman Church has done in our days, not arbitrarily, but pushed on by the force of a necessary consequence. Thus it is not possible that Rome could refuse her sanction to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. These things seem at this moment to have no direct influence on the Evangelical Church, but before long we shall see the theologians of orthodox Protestantism driven at last to the necessity of acknowledging what is contained in their own principles, of which the Roman Church has done nothing but recognize a consequence, and sooner or later it will bring the orthodox to venerate the Virgin."

And now I will adapt and apply to the Vicar, as the representative and embodiment, in this community, of the miserable fraud of Ritualism, the scathing parallel of the great-hearted Marshall,—himself a learned convert from Anglicanism to the Catholic Church. He truly says :

"One point of difference there is between (the Rationalist and the Ritualist), and only one. The Rationalist denies that the creature owes obedience to any spiritual authority whatever, the Ritualist that he owes it to any but the 'Primitive Church.' Refusing his homage to the living spouse of Christ, he hopes to escape being counted among the lawless by professing filial adhesion to the same spouse BEFORE she became impure and defiled. He displays his reverence for her who is 'without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing,' by asserting that she lost all title to reverence before she had begun to convert the barbarians, or to civilize all the Kingdoms of Europe. Yet the Christian who palliates his revolt against her by the plea that he is loyal to an older authority, which he calls the Primitive or Undivided Church, only resembles the citizen who should contend, as a pretext for rejecting the Common Law of England, that his entire submission is reserved for the decrees of the Witenagemote, or the precepts of the Justinian Code. And the answer of the judge would be the same in both cases. The authority by which the Divine Lawgiver tests human obedience, till the second coming of Christ, is not one which expired a thousand or fifteen hundred years ago, but which, like Himself, is '*the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.*'

"I know not if the Rationalist aspires to heaven, or even believes in its existence. If he does, he probably expects that his chief employment there will be to make further discoveries in chemistry or astronomy, or perhaps to give lectures to the Angels on those interest-

ing subjects. The Ritualist certainly believes in heaven, and will display there also, if its gates should be opened to him, his essential agreement with the Rationalist. While the latter will be a scientific missionary to the Angels, the former will be a theological missionary to the Saints. Thus he will represent to St. Peter, if the opportunity should occur, that if he had only disclaimed all personal pre-eminence, and forbidden others to assume it, the fiction of Papal supremacy, for which he is clearly responsible, could never have been established. He will observe to St. Paul, if he can persuade him to listen to him, that *his intemperate injunctions about dogmatic unity were excessive*, and since they could not at any time have been complied with in the Church of England, there can be no clearer proof that they were erroneous. He will reprove St. John, if he is not too far removed from him to do so, for his extravagant doctrine, that whosoever consorts with a heretic 'communicated with his wicked works' Anglicans did it every day, which proves that it was lawful and right. He will severely upbraid St. Augustine, who merely asked the Pope's permission before he came to convert England; and St. Boniface, who culpably swore to obey him before he went to evangelize Germany. He will frown upon St. Bernard, always supposing that he finds himself in his company (on account of 'his excessive devotions to the Virgin'); and turn his back on St. Anselm (who, as Archbishop of Canterbury, introduced the Feast of the Conception of Christ's Blessed Mother into England), and whose language on the same subject is unworthy of a predecessor of (Cranmer and) Parker, Tait (and Dr. Benson, the present incumbent of St. Anselm's See). He will decline to speak to Sir Thomas More, who died rather than revolt against the Pope, a weakness discreditable to a patriotic and enlightened Englishman. And thus, truths previously unknown, save in the British Isles and their favored dependencies, will be gradually diffused throughout Heaven, to the great profit and jubilation of the hitherto uninstructed Saints. Amid such duties and occupations, perfectly adapted to (his) previous habits (the 'Mission Church' Thersites) hopes to enjoy a cheerful eternity."

Here, for the present, I take leave of this Vicar,—the veriest ritualistic Theocrines. I have for the unfortunate man no other feelings but "pity and ruth." "If he seek truth, is he not our brother and to be pitied? If he do not seek truth, is he not still our brother and to be pitied still more?" I have shot across the inner crust of his malicious soul, gleams of radiance from Catholic truth amply sufficient to guide him out of

his labyrinthine prison. Let him now remember that his own Jeremy Taylor warns him, that whoever sins against light kisses the lips of a blazing cannon ; and let him not be indifferent, in his examination of conscience, to his present mental condition, which Shakespeare, with prophetic vision, seems to have had in his eye when he penned these words :

“ But when we in our viciousness grow hard,
The wise gods seal our eyes ;
In our own slime drop our clear judgment, make us
Adore our errors ; laugh at us while we strut
To our confusion.”

And, finally, a word to Bishop Kingdon. I would ask him whether he thinks he has either promoted the dignity, or honored and discharged the responsibilities of his position as a “Teacher in Israel” by imposing upon such a Vicar the task of handling controversially such topics as have engaged our attention in this discussion ? If, however, he thinks that he himself can do it any better, it is surely his duty to buckle on his armor. He has allowed his Vicar to overlay with every species of insult, falsehood, and calumny against the Catholic Church, his miserable statement that *Ipsa* was a misprint for *Ipse*, and that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was founded upon and depended on this misprint. I have held up this statement to the breezes that blow out of all quarters of the sky of Catholic theology ; I have held it up to the winds that blow from the pages of the loftiest mountain-peaks of Catholic scholarship, Biblical and Patristic, and I have thrown in the mighty Protestant names of Grotius and Tischendorf. What is the result ? The *blizzard* has so winnowed the statement that nothing of it is left but a “damned spot” on the reputation of Bishop Kingdon as a scholar and theologian, which will not “out” by all the infamous “perfumes” applied by his Vicar, and which nothing can purge away but an honest confession of mistake with an honorable retraction and apology.

I closed my first letter with the words used, on an ever memorable occasion, by the famous John Duns Scotus, the immortal Franciscan monk, and genuine Oxford scholar. He

uttered them in the University of Paris, whither he was called from Oxford, when, in presence of the assembled glories of contemporary science and genius, he so resolved two hundred arguments on the Immaculate Conception that he went forth from the lists with the title of *Victorious*. In that great contest of giants, he not only determined the future teaching of the Paris faculty, but he gathered to his side all the famous Universities of Europe. Even Pusey concedes that Scotus' "answers to the abstract arguments" are "*invincible*."

I cannot better conclude this discussion than in the words of a genius mightier than Shakespeare. In the 33d Canto of the *Paradiso*, Dante opens with the following magnificent prayer of St. Bernard to the Blessed Mother, on behalf of the Poet himself, who, guided by Beatrice, is present and longs to look even to the throne of God :

O! Virgin Mother, of thy Son a child,
 Most humble, yet above all others great;
 In Wisdom's depths fixed object undefiled:
 Thou who, with wondrous gifts, didst elevate
 Man's nature so, that God approving smiled
 Disdaining not with human flesh to mate.
 Again was lit within thy virgin breast
 The Maker's love; by its sweet ray, like flowers,
 These souls are born into eternal rest.
 Thou art, of Charity, in heavenly bowers,
 Meridian beam; below, the fountain blest
 Of loving hope in mankind's darkest hours.
 So great the power that from thy greatness springs
 O! Lady high, that he, who in his need,
 Seeks not thy help, would soar bereft of wings.
 Nor dost thou always stay a gracious deed
 Until invoked; oft in dubious things
 Thou dost forestall a wish with loving speed.
 In thee bright Mercy, and sweet Pity shine;
 In thee Magnificence; in thee are knit
 What shreds there are in others of divine.
 Wherefore this man, who from hell's lowest pit
 E'en to this place, has seen in ordered line,
 The spirit world, now prays that thou wouldst fit,
 By grace from God obtained, his mortal eye,
 To gaze aloft, unto the awful throne

Of Him the source of perfect bliss Most High.
And I, who never favor of my own
More fervent sought than this, raise up my cry
To thee, (and may it not in vain be thrown)
That frail mortality's encircling cloud
Thou wouldst with prayers dissolve, so to his gaze
The cause of bliss might now his face unshroud.
Lady, who canst, in God's mysterious ways,
Thy every wish obtain, preserve, I ask,
From ill, the senses that such things have seen :
To quell his human pride, be thine the task ;
Behold, Beatrice prays to thee, O ! Queen,
And many Saints with outstretched hands for this.

(Archbishop O'Brien's Translation.)

Ever sincerely yours,
R. F. QUIGLEY.



APPENDIX A.

LETTER FROM BISHOP ROGERS.

THE LATE ARCHBISHOP CONNOLLY.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—May I again ask the kind hospitality of your valuable paper? In the spring of 1885 (GLOBE of the 19th March, 17th April, and 9th May), you granted me the use of your columns to correct, over the signature “Veritas,” some erroneous impressions which the letters of the Rev. J. M. Davenport, Ritualist Anglican minister of the Mission Church, St. John, writing over the *nom de plume* “Catholic,” were calculated to produce in regard to the late Most Rev. Archbishop Connolly. I then stated, in substance, that the said illustrious Archbishop of Halifax (formerly Bishop of St. John), when called to the duty of participating in the deliberations of the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican, fully understood and faithfully discharged the responsibility of his office as a Bishop of the church at that council, in exercising his right with apostolic liberty, yet so as not to derogate from the rights of others, whether equals or superior, during the trying period of the council’s deliberations. I say *trying period*; for it is the conscientious duty of each one, during the proper period of deliberation, to express candidly and clearly his views, even though it may be painfully evident that his views differ from the majority of his colleagues and from those of the Sovereign Pontiff. Then, when the period of deliberation is ended, it becomes the duty of all to acquiesce in the final decision when approved by the Pope; that is, to “Hear the Church,” in submitting one’s own particular will and judgment to the decision and judgment of the higher authority which God has appointed to guide and govern us.

Is there anything wrong or abnormal in this? In temporal affairs, in councils of State as well as in church matters, is not this the correct rule and practice? and in so acting at the Vatican Council did not Archbishop Connolly and the other Bishops of the so-called “minority” act correctly? Evidently Rev. Mr. Davenport thinks not. Like his preference for the forged and repudiated speech of Bishop Strossmayer (does he also admire Pigot’s forgeries, “Parnellism and Crime”?), he seems to prefer that Archbishop Connolly

should have rejected, as he himself does, the decisions of the Catholic Church, even while retaining the name "Catholic."

But, to the point of my letter. I wish in no way to obtrude myself into the controversy between the Rev. Mr. Davenport and Mr. R. F. Quigley in the matter "Ipse, Ipsa"; for I had nothing to do with it from the beginning, except, after it began, to follow with admiring sympathy Mr. Quigley's irrefragable arguments and sound erudition. Both antagonists are valiant champions. But I wish to protest, as earnestly as it is possible, against the forgery of a libellous calumny as stated in Mr. Davenport's letter in your issue of the 18th inst., in reference to Archbishop Connolly at the Vatican Council.

The Rev. Mr. Davenport writes: "I will quote a letter which I myself received from Dr. Nevin, Priest of the American church of St. Paul in Rome, dated December 4, 1885, acknowledging receipt of my pamphlet on Papal Infallibility. 'You are quite in the right,' he says, 'about Archbishop Connolly. . . . He was on one occasion pulled down from the sort of pulpit in which the speakers stood, after they had tried in vain to silence him with cries of *silentium hereticus*. He described this scene to me the same evening in the presence of several members of the Council. Then when he would not yield to the cries with which they attempted to silence him, there was no end of a row,' said the Archbishop, 'and I was got down out of that mighty quick.'"

Now from my own personal knowledge I pronounce this statement to be utterly void of truth. I was present as well as Bishop Sweeney of St. John, Bishop McIntyre of Charlottetown, P. E. I., and many other living Bishops to whom I can appeal, at each of the speeches made by Archbishop Connolly in the hall of the Vatican Council, and no such occurrence as is here stated ever took place in regard to him, nor indeed in regard to any other, but I speak emphatically of him. Nor could he have made such a statement to Dr. Nevin. It would be untrue and absurd. Archbishop Connolly and the priest who was his secretary, Bishop Sweeney, and myself clubbed and messed together during our stay in Rome for the Council, like many other groups of Bishops. We occupied a suite of apartments on the same flat or piazza, each having his own separate room, but our dining room, repasts, recreation room, parlor, temporary altar for mass, carriage for going to the daily meetings of the Bishops, and servants, were in common, and nothing of any importance could happen to any one of us without its becoming known to the others. Hence, I know whereof I speak, and I make this statement simply in the interests of truth and justice, not in any spirit of carping controversy.

Thanking you, Mr. Editor, I remain, etc.,

† J. ROGERS, Bis' of Chatham.

APPENDIX B.

BISHOP STROSSMAYER'S LETTER TO BISHOP MAES.

Right Rev. and Illustrious Bishop: Most Beloved Brother in Christ:

I reply to your two letters informing me that various things under my name, prejudicial to the Catholic faith and Church, are circulated in your country. Every one of the pieces circulated and published in your country in my name, prejudicial to the Catholic Church and faith, are malignant inventions; are lies, are calumnies, concocted at the instigation of him who goeth about the flock of the Lord seeking whom he may devour. I deem it my glory, and I regard it as one of the chief gifts of Divine goodness, that I was born of pious Catholic parents and brought up by them, and have all my life constantly adhered to the Catholic faith. It is almost sixty years since I was ordained priest, and for forty years I have belonged to the episcopate; all this time I have openly and publicly taught and explained the whole uncorrupted Catholic doctrine according to the sense of Mother Church. This is attested by almost numberless documents, most of them public and official. It gives me great grief and sadness of mind that men can be found so giddy and perverse as to dare to abuse my name and authority, in order to seduce souls redeemed by the blood of Christ and called to the hope of immortality, and wrest them from the Catholic Church.

Soon after the Vatican Council a sermon was published, purporting to have been delivered by me, which teemed throughout with insults and contumely against the Catholic faith and Church. I have again and again in private and public denounced this impious and most sacrilegious sermon as apocryphal, falsely and mendaciously ascribed to my mouth and my name; but the impious fraud and forgery devised for the destruction of souls has not yet ceased. At last, however, I was informed by a certain pious American priest and confessor that he had attended an apostate priest who on his deathbed confessed that he was the author of the above-mentioned fraud and forgery, and had ascribed the said impious sermon to me; he added entreaties that as a sign of final repentance and expiation this should be communicated to me and my pardon obtained. All this I made known at Rome and published widely, and the storm against me was somewhat lulled for a time.

By your letters, dearest brother, I see that the old enemies of the Catholic faith and Church have returned to their vomit, and, as the prophet says, "become an outspread net for the faithful people." I

beg and implore you, dear brother, in your piety and zeal to refute these calumnies, and by means of this letter publicly to brand them as impious frauds. Let all know, especially those most likely to incur danger of being seduced and perverted, that the Catholic Church is most dear to me, and that I have always and everywhere preached it as the most divine work of the Eternal Father, as the true and living body of Christ our Lord, God, and Saviour; as the most holy spouse of the Holy Ghost, from whom she seeks her strength, her invincibility, and her perpetual triumphs. The Catholic Church is to me the only mediatrix between God and men, the only true dispenser of the mysteries of the Holy Cross, so that it is due to the Catholic Church alone if those gifts of supernatural grace are never wanting to the human race, with which it not only cannot absolutely dispense, if we are to retain the inheritance which we have acquired by the mystery of the cross, or even in the natural order those good ends pleasing to God, to which within the limits of our mortality we may lawfully aspire.

We must on this earth have the Catholic Church as a Mother if we would merit to have God in heaven as our Father. Any man or any nation that desires its divine and human vocation to be made perfect and sanctified by the elements and gifts of the supernatural order, must be in connection with the Catholic Church, either immediately, that is, with its body and soul; or at least mediately, that is, with its soul. This has been, is, and ever will continue to be my doctrine as to the Catholic Church. To her I freely and with all my heart ascribe, what St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage and Martyr, enlightened by the Holy Ghost, wrote in his treatise on the Unity of the Church: "The Church is one, which is extended widely into a multitude by the fruitfulness of her growth. As the rays of the sun are many, but the light one; and many the branches of the tree, but one the trunk supported by a firm root; and as from one fountain many streams flow, and the multiplicity may seem immense in the number of gushing branches, yet unity is preserved in the origin. If a ray is severed from the body of the sun, the unity of the light receives no division; rend a branch from a tree, the fragment cannot germinate; cut off a stream from its source, the severed stream dries up. Indeed, it is self-apparent; unity, concord, harmony belong to the essence and, as it were, to the inmost soul of Christ; so that where there is unity, concord, harmony, there undoubtedly is the Church; where unity, concord, harmony are wanting, there infallibly the Church, too, for that very reason is wanting. Unity, concord, harmony, is the highest and most evident proof of the divinity of the Catholic Church." Whatever the holy Martyr says of the unity of the Church, he says of the Church

of God itself. The Catholic Church is then the sun, whose rays enlighten all churches and nations throughout the whole world. The Catholic Church is the oak, braced by a sturdy root; its fruit, all those whom the different churches and nations bring to the salvation of eternal and temporal life, are due to the fecundity of this divine tree and trunk.

The Catholic Church is the fountain of the unfailing river, springing from eternity itself, and gliding on to eternity through the whole series of ages, filling all the streams of the different churches and nations fully with the welling torrent of its waters, to an inexhaustible abundance and plenty of celestial and terrestrial fecundity. Moreover, I love, cherish, and honor the Roman Church as matrix and mistress of all churches throughout the world. To the Church of Rome I do most freely and with my whole heart endorse the splendid testimony of St. Irenæus, Bishop and Martyr, in his work against Heresies.

The same saint (Book III., chap. iii. of that work) extols the glory of the Roman Church, which he calls the greatest and most ancient, founded by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul. To this Church, he says, on account of its more powerful principality, the whole Church must necessarily be united, that is, the faithful who are everywhere, for in her is ever preserved, by the faithful everywhere, the tradition derived from the apostles. Moreover, of the same Church and in the same work he affirms that the apostles brought together into her, as into a certain rich deposit of the Holy Ghost, whatever truth there is. Often and often do I say to myself as I regard these rights and prerogatives of the Roman Church: May God, merciful and patient, rather forget me and my salvation than that I should forget what I owe to this most glorious and ancient Church. May my voice rather cling forever to my lips and become dumb, may my right hand rather wither than that I should utter or write a word that is not to the praise, the honor, and the glory of this Church. This has been, is, and ever will be forever constantly my faith, my judgment, my conviction. I know, moreover, and feel in my heart that this right, privilege, and glory of the Roman Church is due especially to the Sovereign Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, whose throne is fixed at Rome forever.

The Sovereign Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, is the vicar on this earth of Jesus Christ Himself, our God and Saviour. He is the visible head of the Church, he is the father of his believers, he is the supreme pastor of the Lord's flock, he is the infallible teacher of all the sheep and lambs in the Church of God. He is the source and eternal pledge of the unity of the Church, and of the unity of the

sacerdotal order, so that, according to St. Ambrose: where Peter is, there is the Church; and according to St. Augustine: Rome has spoken, the case is decided. I have ever adopted as my own what our St. Jerome wrote to Pope Damasus (Ep. xv., *Ad eundem*): "I am united by communion with your Holiness, that is, with the chair of Peter; I know that the Church is built on that rock. Whoso eateth the lamb outside this house is profane. If any one is not in the ark of Noah, he will perish when the deluge holds sway." This has been most constantly my faith, my judgment, and the unalterable rule of my life, which I hope to bear whole and unsullied to the very throne of God as a token of my eternal life and salvation. Finally, I honor the present Sovereign Pontiff, the most glorious Leo XIII., with absolutely filial piety, reverence, obedience, and adhesion, and if it could be, I would most willingly be totally united to him, not only in my soul and heart, but also in body and in my earthly lot, to his cross and chains, and to all he suffers, even unto death, well aware that I would thus most completely become partaker of his praise, honor, and glory.

All this, I beseech you, dear brother, publish in your papers, and confound my malignant slanderers. God bless you! Give me your attachment, and remember me in your prayers.

† JOSEPH GEORGE, Bishop.

DJAKOVAR, June 18, 1889.

APPENDIX C.

LETTER FROM REV. DR. LEE (ANGLICAN), ON LITTLE-DALE'S "PLAIN REASONS."

A CRUSHING REPLY.—A PROTESTANT REFUTES PROTESTANT CALUMNIES.

"We publish this week what we may perhaps best describe as a 'smashing' letter from the Rev. Frederick George Lee, D.D., Vicar of All Saints', Lambeth. Dr. Lee, of course, writes from his own standpoint, and there are one or two incidental remarks as to which we are likely to remain in permanent disagreement with him, but nothing could well be more effective than his brilliant and trenchant exposure of the reckless carelessness and slovenly scholarship of the man who, with a light heart, has set himself to 'criticise the saints, correct the Popes, and snub the Cardinals.' Indeed our read-

ers may even be a little curious to know what is left of 'Plain Reasons,' when they learn that for its 200 pages, Dr. Littledale has already had to make 201 retractions, and that its latest edition contains a Preface with 'no less than 13,340 words of *errata*.' This signal discomfiture of Dr. Littledale we trust may prove a lesson and a warning to other rash assailants of the Church of God."—*London Tablet*.

Below we give the letter referred to:—

AN ANGLICAN ON ANGLICAN CONTROVERSY.

Sir,—Certain generous and wise words which you published on November 4th, 1882, lead me to trouble you with this letter, and to ask you to favor me by printing it.

ENGLAND'S MOST IMMINENT DANGER.

Your words stood thus: "Anything which tends to weaken the influence of the Church of England as a teacher of those religious truths which she, however imperfectly, holds and proclaims, appears to us to be matter of regret, as so much gain to the cause of secularism and unbelief." Even from your point of view, in a certain sense, the scaffolding and organization of the Established Church, including more particularly baptism and marriage, is after the ancient type, and is inherently Christian. It has lost much, I know, and its needs are numerous; our ancestors were betrayed, robbed, hoodwinked, persecuted and defrauded by the Tudors, and, as a consequence, religion itself, and England as a nation, have grievously suffered. Whether, in the future, the national church, after disestablishment and disendowment, will break up, remains to be seen. If it does, our beloved country will be far on the way to reverting to paganism. And atheism subsequently may become very powerful, if not dominant, to our great woe and loss, for all of us.

WHAT DR. LEE WISHES TO SEE ACCOMPLISHED.

Surely, therefore, to maintain and mend the Church of England without breaking it up, to regain what has been lost, to restore it to visible corporate communion with the Holy See (as did Cardinal Pole under Queen Mary) and not to destroy it, seems to me the right and proper policy to adopt. I see nothing wrong in such a programme and plan, but everything that is wise and good, righteous and true. This being so, and having been so with myself for more than thirty years, I rejoiced when I read your politic, sensible, and kindly-expressed words, and often read them anew.

A GOOD WORD FOR THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.

Everything that tends to remove the dark shadow of polemical misrepresentation from the minds of patriotic Englishmen seems to me distinct advantage to the country. The Tractarian movement not only began this good work, but steadily carried it on for years. In the various restorations effected, malignant, long-cherished prejudices have been laid to rest, mistakes admitted, history re-written, old truths regained, zeal and self-denial brought to the forefront. In most of our ancient Cathedrals, where the Abomination of Desolation was set up by the Poynets, Riddleys, Bales and Aylmers of old, such beneficent restorations have been effected as that Mass might therein be said again with all proper dignity and order at a few days' notice. During the last half century, moreover, nearly 6,000 new churches and chapels have been built in England, and more than that number of old sanctuaries creditably restored.

A RITUALISTIC BLUNDER—DR. LITTLEDALE.

Now, just as a breach of unity sealed divisions, and all kinds of dangerous and worthless sects and everlasting wranglings sprang from the deplorable Tudor changes; so ought peace and harmony and re-union to spring from, and become the direct and distinct outcome and the final crown of the Oxford or Tractarian movement—evidently from God. Anything that tends to hinder such a desirable consummation is mischievous, disastrous, and certainly not from above. It is because I feel very keenly that the recent pitiable policy of the Ritualists in matters controversial—so greatly at variance with that of forty years ago—is both dangerous and disastrous; and that in several particulars this movement, instead of being *constructive*, is now actually *de-structive*, that I venture to assure you that a large portion of the English clergy—many of them retiring, uncontroversial, and peace-loving—have no sympathy whatsoever with the blatant and boisterous noise of mere professional controversialists, who, with arrogance and art, but with no responsibility, are doing their best to render future peace and unity, humanly speaking, impossible. No publication with which I am acquainted has been more disastrous in its aim and consequences than “Plain Reasons,” published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. More than 35,000 copies have been sold, and its readers, of course, have been numerous. Its success, as a literary speculation, is one of the darkest signs of the times. Had we a body of clergy with a sound theological education, such a publication must have been met first only with a chilling welcome from those being duped, and then with a howl of execration. I will not directly say more than that, having carefully examined it in conjunction with

others—the first edition was the last—we have found it to be mercifully unfair, and altogether untrustworthy. I would that we could regard its compiler as unintentionally misled and mistaken. The book will very possibly destroy the faith of many.

DR. LITTLEDALE'S "CORRECTIONS."

Now I here ask you, sir, to note that, independent of eighteen separate apologetic letters sent from time to time (from 1880 to 1885) to the *Guardian* and *Church Times*, each containing certain retractions, emendations, and corrections of mistakes which had been pointed out, the author, in a new edition of his book, published in 1881, prefixed no less than twenty-nine pages of closely printed "additions and corrections" (mainly the latter), each page containing forty-six lines, and each line about ten words; thus making no less than 13,340 words of *errata*—a somewhat unprecedented and startling literary performance, and a remarkable example of original slip-slop and random accusation—for a person who, criticising the saints, correcting the Popes, and snubbing the Cardinals, claims to hector and teach other people, and whose book in its totality does not extend to two hundred pages. Every fresh edition has received fresh corrections, while in several cases the corrections are equally inaccurate with the statements presumed to be corrected.

TABULATED STATEMENT OF CORRIGENDA AND ERRATA.

The various *errata* and explanatory additions referred to, as can be calculated and seen, amount, I am given to conclude, to exactly two hundred and one. These—which will probably be set forth at length in a future publication—are, of course, of different kinds, some more important than others, and have thus been carefully tabulated by myself and two friends:

Corrigenda and Errata.—Regarding historical or traditional facts, 51; regarding dogmatic facts, historical and theological, 43; regarding quotations, either first or second hand, from writers on history and canon law, with inaccurate conclusions from uncertain premises, 29; regarding historical and theological quotations half made, often with certain remarkable omissions or qualifications, and consequently, for purposes of controversy, imperfectly and not fairly quoted, 30; regarding short scraps of quotations from the Fathers, which, when sought out and studied, are found to bear an entirely different meaning from that which, for controversial purposes, they were credited, 24; moreover, the compiler of "Plain Reasons" has, on no less than seventeen occasions, made mistakes in confusing the personal opinions of Catholic writers on dogma, canon law, or ecclesiastical history with the defined and authorita-

tive faith of the Catholic Church—a somewhat serious series of additional *errata*, 17; furthermore, in seven cases he has assumed that certain current opinions—highly probable opinions, no doubt, but as yet only opinions—are without any doubt dogmatic facts, sacred dogmas, and part of the unchangeable Divine deposit, and has argued accordingly. This is neither fair nor faithful. The “opinions” even of Popes or canonized saints are opinions, and nothing more. Such opinions are not imposed on the faithful, and may be distinct from the Catholic faith, 7. Total, 201.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION.

Several of the above referred to *corrigenda* and sub-added notes contain several other retractions, further detailed explanations, and careful explainings-away of grave mistakes. The artful and insincere criticism (and I must add supreme nonsense) which is found regarding the doctrine of intention—a doctrine as familiar to law as to theology, and as important to one as to the other (for if good faith were not kept in ordinary public and official acts, where should we be?)—is so utterly puerile and ridiculous, that it can only take in those who are anxious to be deluded. If one man, in the presence of another, apparently executing a legal deed, deliberately and openly declares, “I do *not* deliver this as my act and deed”—the proper intention is wanting, and the signed instrument is probably invalid, and certainly open to have its value contested. So most probably in regard to an official sacramental act when the general intention has been found to have been absolutely withheld.

ADVERSE PROTESTANT CRITICISMS OF DR. LITLEDALE.

Many of the criticisms in question, though maintained with some show of learning, are accurately enough measured at their true value by those Anglicans competent to form an opinion. Circumstances have placed at my disposal numerous comments upon the book criticised. I select a few as evidence that the new and disastrous policy embodied in “Plain Reasons” is by many repudiated; its method being mistrusted, its very gross and uncharitable language deplored, and its conclusions rejected. I only wish those clergymen in official places, who are so ready and even voluble to condemn it in private, would have the courage of their opinions in public. But this is scarcely a courageous age. Wills are too often weak, and moral backbones either disjointed or broken.

An Honorary Canon of Oxford Cathedral writes:

“No long experience of ‘Plain Reasons’ has proved to me that the plan of appealing to mere reason, and bringing everything down to its own level in dealing with Romanism, is likely to be turned to

a deadly account in dealing with the great doctrines of the Trinity and of God manifest in the flesh. . . . I know two at least whom the book has made first anti-Roman and then scoffing infidels."

Another clergyman of the Diocese of Oxford writes: "In my parish and neighborhood it has done more harm than good, making its readers, in some cases, often loose believers, and then Christians unattached. In others, it has sent devout minds, shocked by its unpleasant cynicism, over to Rome."

Mr. Shirley Brabazon, of Stoke, Oxfordshire, expressed in public (14th of October, 1881) the following sentiment: "A book which has been corrected in nearly a hundred cases of misstatement, should have been first submitted to some competent author . . . before being put in print. It shakes our confidence in the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and it is not creditable that no expression of regret was made by its committee for the circulation of errors and fictions. Dishonesty in controversy, especially in religious controversy, even when resulting from want of necessary inquiry beforehand, is much to be deprecated."

Dr. Mossman, of Torrington, Lincolnshire, in 1881, wrote thus: "The book appears to me to be written in a most reprehensible spirit. Unless exposed and refuted, it is calculated to do grievous harm to the blessed and holy cause of corporate reunion. The book cannot, of course, mislead any one who is really acquainted with ecclesiastical history and dogmatic theology, but how very few of its readers will know that it is little more than a crude *congeries* of fallacies and erroneous statements, taken at second hand, which have been exposed and refuted again and again."

Another clergyman, of the Diocese of Salisbury, writes: "I am not prepared to face the malice and malevolence of (a certain religious newspaper), otherwise I could easily point out a score of mistakes and misrepresentations (in 'Plain Reasons') as to our relations with the saints in glory—their help, our duty."

A Rector in Kent, in a published letter in 1882, put on record his judgment, as follows: "That such a book should be issued at all by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is a sign of deterioration, and a bad sign, too. For to drive more wedges into the breach between us and Rome, and to make it bigger and wider, is not to my mind the work of a Catholic (?) priest, now that irreligion, unbelief, and profanity are extending so."

The Rev. Wentworth Hankey, of Christ Church, Oxford, in August, 1881, wrote thus: "I shall be much obliged, if you will allow me, as an Anglican clergyman, who prefers Dr. Littledale's past to his present views, to express the shame and indignation with which I have from the first regarded the publication of 'Plain Reasons.'

Since the issue of translations into French and Italian, the claim of the work to be defensive and not aggressive can no longer be sustained; and considering what manner of men are the vast majority of the Church's enemies in France and Italy, I protest in the name of our common Christianity against any such attempt to weaken the hands of the Church."

HANDLING DR. LITLEDALE "WITHOUT GLOVES."

The Rev. E. W. Gilliam remarked of its author's controversial writings that they are "so evidently dictated by ill-feeling and prejudice, and the rules of good breeding are so completely ignored by him, that a reader of any refinement of mind instinctively draws back from one who seems thus regardless of the first principles of Christian moderation and ordinary charity." Adding, with much force and terseness of "Plain Reasons": "Entirely negative in character, it is, moreover, a coarse, vituperative, brutal book, without piety and without justice—a book whose spirit has nothing in common with a holy and upright mind."

I am informed by persons who know them that Canon Liddon, Canon Carter, Bishop King, Prebendary West of Lincoln, Mr. R. M. Benson of Cowley, Mr. Chancellor Wagner, and others, have expressed their dislike of the methods, assertions, and style of reasoning of "Plain Reasons," in terms more or less in harmony with the various sentiments just quoted.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

To return to the book itself. As regards the important doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which has always been held by the Catholic Church, it is perfectly certain the first Bishop of Norwich, Herbert de Losinga (1050-1119) taught it as a matter of course, openly and publicly, with the greatest distinctness. Here are words—a strong contrast to the confused sentiments and distressing profanity of certain preachers at Oxford thirty-five years ago—taken from one of Bishop de Losinga's sermons: "She, the Blessed Virgin, was made white with many virtues and merits; yea, whiter than the driven snow was she made by the gift of the Holy Ghost; and showed forth in all things the simplicity of the dove, since whatever was done in her was all purity and simplicity, was all pure grace, was all the mercy and justice which looked down from heaven. And therefore is she called undefiled (*et ideo immaculata*) because in nothing was she corrupt (*quia in nullo corrupta*)."—Vol. ii., p. 349.¹

¹ Life and Letters of Herbert de Losinga, Bishop of Norwich. By E. M. Goulborne, Dean, and Henry Symonds, M.A., Precentor of Norwich Cathedral. In two volumes. London: 1878.

THE ASSUMPTION AND INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

And the following beautiful passage relates to the dogmatic fact of the Assumption, and to the consoling and sustaining doctrine of the Invocation of Saints: "To-day the Most Blessed Virgin Mary was taken up above the heavens, and in the presence of the Holy Apostles her body was placed in the sepulchre. She died, but a body of such excellent dignity could not (as Blessed Gregory saith) long be held in the bonds of death. For it was impossible that the flesh should be corrupted by a long death of which the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. For if at the Lord's resurrection many bodies of the saints that slept arose, how could that flesh not rise again which gave birth to the Author of life Himself? With a full and undoubting faith, believe ye, my brethren, that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, made immortal, both in body and soul, sitteth at the right hand of God, with her Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, being the mother of penitents, and the most effectual intercessor for our sins with her most gracious Son."—Vol. ii., pp. 351, 352.

BASELESS AND PROFANE CHARGES.

With regard to what is set forth in "Plain Reasons" concerning Church law, the maxims of Ferraris and other canonists quoted are no more infallible, as is practically assumed, than are the personal opinions of Sir Robert Phillimore and Sir Edmund Beckett equivalent to our authoritative declaration of what is the present law of the Established Church. The charges of "accumulated falsehood," of "entire disregard for truth," of "deliberate and conscious falsehood with fraudulent intent," and that "truth pure and simple is almost never to be found, and the whole truth in no case whatever," in the Roman Catholic Church, are statements exceedingly shocking, and in most cases have the exactly opposite effect intended. Such vague charges are incapable of being met, for they are baseless as they are profane. In one case this accuser of his brethren goes so far as to deliberately charge Baronius with purposely altering a date, and of deliberately falsifying the Roman martyrology for certain controversial purposes. Now, any historian is liable to a chronological error; yet no certain evidence of the accuracy of the grave charge in question exists; while a writer who has himself made no less than two hundred retractions or explanations in a hastily compiled book of two hundred pages, should not (without any hearing or defense) be severe upon a Christian hero who may possibly have made one in two thousand.

BROUGHT TO TASK BY A GREEK.

Dr. Littledale's treatment of the Seventh Œcumenical Council and its decrees has brought down upon him a scornful and wither-

ing criticism by Professor Damalas of Mount Athos, referred to in a recent number of a German literary serial, which I have not seen, but which a learned Anglican friend informs me is painful to read, and quite impossible to answer.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF DR. LITLEDALE'S METHOD.

In fine, only let the Sacred doctrines of the Blessed Trinity, of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, of the Incarnation, of the Two Wills of our Blessed Saviour, of the Sacraments and of the Episcopate, be treated in a like carping and rationalistic method with which the writer of "Plain Reasons" has dealt with the need of a Visible Head to a Visible Church, and the exercise by delegation of our Lord's Universal Sovereignty, and the mischief of the method would be apparent. Furthermore, devotion to and invocation of the saints, which of course is only the "communion of saints" (in which all profess to believe) put into practice, the state of the faithful departed, the Immaculate Conception and Assumption of our Blessed Lady, would by a like rationalistic and destructive method, be swept away. The Catholic faith, however, is like a perfect and complete arch. If but one stone be removed and several others be painstakingly battered and intentionally broken, there is a grave danger that the whole archway may fall.

DR. LEE AGAIN EXPRESSES HIS GREAT HOPE.

I conclude, therefore, that for more than three and a half centuries in England destruction, protests, negations, bitter controversies, and self-pleasing have done more than enough evil and mischievous work; and that the Established Church, now confronted by indifference, atheism, sectarian spite, and avowed agnosticism—can only retain its present position, or be proved to be worth its salt, by its leaders and officials making a zealous endeavor to restore what is wanting, and to secure from ecclesiastical authority in the face of Christendom a restoration of what has lapsed and been lost—the original scheme, so far as there was one, of Newman and Pusey, of Manning, Keble, Froude, and Ward. By this means all Christians—like animals when attacked by a common foe—might at first be led in mere self-defence to herd together, and then, under supreme authority, to act together for the honor of God, the extension of the Catholic faith, and the advantage of Christendom. In this hope, I subscribe myself, sir, your obedient and obliged servant,

FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.D.

All Saints' Vicarage, Lambeth, S. E., Rogation Sunday, 1885.

APPENDIX D.

WHEN I asserted in the text, that to De Rossi's Catholic mind there was no doctrinal difference between the three readings, *Ipsa*, *Ipsa*, *Ipsum*, I had before me only the extract from his great work given by Pusey, and I relied entirely upon my Catholic instinct in the matter. It has not deceived me. I have since examined the work itself, and it confirms every statement I have made. De Rossi translates the Hebrew by *Ipsum*, but he agrees with Lucas Brugensis that *Ipsa* is not opposed to the Hebrew *in sense*, and he adds the testimony of the learned Father Bukentop to the Catholic meaning of *Ipsa* in these words: *Idem repetit Bukentopius addens dici posse Ipsa, sicut Gen. xii. 3, dicitur in te benedicentur universal cognationes terræ, id est in semine tuo, ut Deus ipse explicat Gen. xxii. 18.*" De Rossi here refers to Bukentop's work—*Lux de luce*, written in reply to James' *Bellum Papale*. I have given the words of Lucas Brugensis in the "Postscript" to the fourth letter of the *Rejoinder*.

APPENDIX E.

IN the Twenty-eighth letter I refer to Maimonides and his book entitled *The Guide of the Perplexed*. I state that it was written in Arabic and afterwards translated into Hebrew by himself. This I desire to correct. From Friedlander's translation of *The Guide of the Perplexed* I find that it was composed in Arabic and written in Hebrew characters. Subsequently it was translated into Hebrew by Rabbi Samuel Ibn Yibbou, in the lifetime of Maimonides, who was consulted by the translator on all difficult passages.

20000101884
EXPL-THA2

ERRATA.

Page 132, line 11, insert a *period* after "St. Gregory."

	<i>For</i>	<i>Read</i>
" 139, " 18 from bottom,	when	where.
" 144, " 7,	an	any.
" 145, note,	male	malo.
" 171, line 6 from bottom,	Carsus	Cursus.
" 250, " 10 "	after " <i>was</i> "	insert with.
" 267, " 7 "	Bible	Biblical.
" 284, " 4,	Now	Nor.
" 335, " 8 "	Editio Justinianæo	Justiniani's Edition.
" 353, " 5 "	after " <i>than</i> "	insert in.
" 354, " 9 "	" " <i>those</i> "	erase who.
" 354, " 10 "	guam	quam.
" 368, " 3 "	probe	prove.
" 377, " 10 "	less	lies.
" 378, " 7 "	on	in.
" 383, " 20 "	has	have.
" 403, " 9 "	better	bitter.
" 414, " 14 "	{ habetat narrationem	{ habebat narrationum. }
" 418, " 2,	the	these.
" 419, " 20,	Letters	Letter.
" 429, " 17 "	Evazrius	Evagrius.
" 430, " 16 "	His	this.
" 433, " 4 "	Creto	Crete.
" 435, " 4 "	last	lust.
" 471, " 14 "	universal	universæ.
" 471, " 2 "	Yibbon	Tibbon.

At page 45, 9th line, where Father De Rossi's meaning is discussed, refer to Appendix D.